JEWISH ANTIQUITIES:

OR A

COURSE of LECTURES

On the Three FIRST BOOKS of

GODWIN'S MOSES and AARON.

To which is annexed,

A

DISSERTATION

ON THE

HEBREW LANGUAGE.

By the late Rev. *DAVID JENNINGS*, D.D

In TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

LONDON:

Printed for J. JOHNSON and B. DAVENPORT,
the Globe in Paternoster-Row.

MDCCLXVI.

BRITISH MUSEUM

THE PREFACE BY THE EDITOR.

THE learned and worthy author originally compoſed the following treatiſe for the private uſe of thoſe theological pupils, who ſtudied under his own direction; and it is now offered to the publick, as deſerving the peruſal of all, who would obtain an intimate acquaintance with the ſacred oracles, eſpecially with the Old Teſtament; as well as of thoſe whose profeſſion leads them more directly to the ſtudy of divinity. Many paſſages of the word of God are here ſkilfully explained and illuſtrated, and many more may be ſo, by a judicious

dicious application of that knowledge of jewiſh antiquities which is comprized in theſe lectures. The repreſentation made in them of the rites, cuſtoms and opinions of the Jews, chiefly reſpects thoſe which are found in ſcripture; for the clear underſtanding of which, beſides carefully examining and comparing the accounts given in the ſacred code, and deriving as much light as poſſible from that fountain, the author hath called in the aſſiſtance of Joſephus and Philo, and on ſome occaſions, of the jewiſh rabbies, as well as of a great variety of other writers, both ancient and modern, who have treated concerning the Jews and their affairs. Of the rabbinical writers he had indeed a very mean opinion, both in reſpect to the credit due to them, as relaters of ancient facts, or of eſtabliſhed cuſtoms and opinions; and in reſpect to their judgment, as interpreters of ſcripture. Maimonides, Aben-Ezra and Abarbanel, are the moſt eminent of this claſs, and almoſt the only perſons amongſt them, who diſcover a judicious and rational turn of mind. Of Maimonides in particular it is ſaid, that he was the firſt Jew, who ceaſed to trifle, qui deſiit deſipere. But even theſe authors, though more reſpectable than moſt of their brethren, come too late, to have much ſtreſs laid upon their report of the ſentiments and practices of the ancient Jews, if not ſupported

ported or countenanced by ſcripture, or by ſome other writer of more antiquity and greater authority than themſelves.

Though the learned author choſe to execute his deſign upon the plan of the three firſt books of Godwin's Moſes and Aaron, his work nevertheleſs doth not conſiſt of detached remarks on the text of that writer, but of diſtinct and compleat diſſertations on the ſubjects treated of by him, and on ſome others which he hath omitted; inſomuch that it is not neceſſary to have recourſe continually to Godwin, in the peruſal of the following volumes; which muſt have been the reader's diſagreeable taſk, had this work been a collection of ſhort notes and obſervations. In one or two places the editor hath taken the liberty of inſerting either from Godwin or from Hottinger's notes upon him, what ſeemed neceſſary to compleat the ſubject, and render the diſcourſe regular and uniform; particularly in the chapter on the gates of Jeruſalem, which in the author's MS copy conſiſted merely of what the reader will here find on the miracle which our Saviour wrought at the pool of Bethesda; ſituated as ſome ſuppoſe, near the ſheep-gate. Nevertheleſs though it is not requiſite frequently to turn to Godwin, in peruſing this work, for a compleat view of the ſubject, yet if the correſpondent chapters in the

two

two treatiſes are read in conjunction, we ſhall ſee reaſon, on the compariſon, to entertain the higher opinion of the induſtry with which our learned author hath collected his materials, and of the judgment and ſkill with which he hath diſcuſſed the particular ſubject before him.

The editor hath taken care all along, to inſert the words of the texts of ſcripture, which occur, and which in the manuſcript were only quoted by the chapter and verſe. The author might reaſonably expect from his pupils, that the paſſages referred to ſhould be carefully conſulted; but it would have been irkſome and tedious to the generality of readers, to be continually turning to paſſages of ſcripture, in order to underſtand the meaning of the author's obſervations upon them, or reaſoning from them. And the neceſſity the editor was under of introducing the texts, obliged him to make ſome ſmall alterations in the phraſeology, eſpecially in the connective particles and ſentences, and even a few tranſpoſitions, in order to introduce them conſiſtently with the regularity and uniformity of the whole.

The references to authors, either for proof or illuſtration, which are very numerous, have for the moſt part been carefully examined, and made very particular, for the benefit of thoſe who are diſpoſed to

conſult

conſult the authorities on which the author relies, or thoſe writers who have treated more largely on the ſubject. For want of producing his authorities, Lewis's Jewiſh Antiquities, which are otherwiſe valuable, are very unſatisfactory to a man who is deſirous not only to know what hath been ſaid, but by whom it hath been ſaid, and what credit it deſerves.

With reſpect to the diſſertation on the hebrew language, it may be obſerved, that the author once thought more highly of the antiquity and authority of the maſoretic readings and of the vowel-points, than he did after peruſing the ingenious and learned Dr. Kennicott's two diſſertations, eſpecially his ſecond, on the hebrew text; by which the author, as well as the generality of the learned world, was convinced, they deſerved not that extravagant and ſuperſtitious regard, which the credit of the two Buxtorfs, and of ſome other eminent hebraicians in the laſt age, had procured them from men of letters. Once in particular he expreſſed his ſentiments on this ſubject to the editor, and gave ſome general idea of his intended alteration in the diſſertation on the jewiſh language; which it is preſumed, he was prevented from accompliſhing by the declining ſtate of his health, for ſome time before his deceaſe. The editor hath endeavoured to ſupply this little defect in

ſome

ſome meaſure, by inſerting a few references to and obſervations from Dr. Kennicott, and by ſoftening a few expreſſions in conformity with the author's lateſt ſentiments on this head.

The reader will obſerve ſome digreſſions, in the earlier part of the work eſpecially, to ſubjects which have an affinity to thoſe of which the author is treating. Some of theſe the editor hath thrown into notes, and might perhaps have done it with a few more, particularly in the chapter on the patriarchal government. As moſt of theſe relate to illuſtrations of ſcripture, the author was willing to indulge himſelf in them; declaring to his pupils, that he never thought himſelf out of his way, while he was explaining the ſacred oracles. However theſe digreſſions are not numerous, and chiefly at the beginning of the work.

Though theſe volumes profeſſedly treat of the ſubjects, which are contained in the three firſt books of Godwin, yet ſeveral things are occaſionally introduced relative to the ſubjects of his three laſt books; which was one reaſon, why the author did not proceed to the particular conſideration of them. Another was, that the three firſt books comprize all the ſubjects which relate to the ſacred or eccleſiaſtical antiquities of the Hebrews, and which are peculiarly requiſite to the underſtanding of the jewiſh,

and

and conſequently in ſome meaſure, of the chriſtian ſcheme of theology.

This piece of Godwin, ſtiled Moſes and Aaron, the method of which our author choſe to follow, hath been annotated and commented upon by a variety of authors. One of the moſt judicious, who have favoured the publick with their lucubrations, is Hottinger. There are two ſets of annotations in manuſcript, one by the learned Witſius, which he read to his ſtudents in the univerſity of Leyden; a copy of which was in the hands of Dr. Jennings, who hath been in a few inſtances, and but in a few, beholden to it. Another annotator whoſe performance is yet in manuſcript, was the learned Mr. Samuel Jones of Tewkſbury. His work, of which there are ſeveral copies extant, is written in neat Latin, and contains very valuable remarks, which diſcover his great learning and accurate knowledge of his ſubject. From this writer the editor hath inſerted a note in vol. II. p. 71. and in a few other places. Dr. Jennings never ſaw Mr. Jones's annotations, though there is a ſimilarity in a few of their obſervations, they having both been in poſſeſſion of a copy of Witſius. But the doctor's own work ſupaſſes the performances of both theſe learned writers, as in ſome other reſpects, ſo particularly in compaſs and variety, and as it contains the opinions and improvements of later authors.

And

And it is hoped it will anſwer the end for which it was originally compoſed, and is now publiſhed, the advancement of religion and learning, and the knowledge of thoſe oracles of God, which are able to make us wiſe to ſalvation.

Philip Furneaux.

5 DE60

THE

THE CONTENTS OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

BOOK I.

CONCERNING Persons.

CHAP. I. Page

Of the form of the Hebrew commonwealth. 3

CHAP. II.

Of the Publicans and taxes. 82

CHAP. III.

Israelites and Proselytes. 99

CHAP. IV.

Of the Kings. 163

CHAP. V.

Of the High-priests, Priests, Levites and Nethinim. 190

CHAP. VI.

Of the Prophets. 342

CHAP.

CONTENTS.

CHAP. VII. Page

Of the title Rabbi. 407

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Nazarites and Rechabites 415

CHAP IX.

Of the Affideans and Karraites 430

CHAP. X.

Of the Pharifees 437

CHAP. XI.

Of the Sadducees and Samaritans 455

CHAP. XII.

Of the Effenes 463

CHAP XIII.

Of the Gaulonites and Herodians 473

5 DE60

JEWISH ANTIQUITIES:

BOOK the FIRST

Concerning Persons.

JEWISH ANTIQUITIES:

BOOK I.

Concerning Perſons.

BRITISH MUSEUM

CHAP. I.

Of the form of the HEBREW commonwealth.

THE ancient state and form of the hebrew government may be distinguished into patriarchal and special. The patriarchal universally prevailed in the first ages. By special, we mean the government peculiar to the people of Israel, from the time of their entrance into Egypt to the end of their polity.

Of the patriarchal form of government.

I. The patriarchal form (so called from πατρια familia, and αρχων princeps) is defined by Godwin to consist, in "the fathers of families, and their first-born after them, exercising all kinds of ecclesiastical and civil authority in their respective households; blessing, cursing, casting out of doors, disinheriting and punishing with death."

It is natural to suppose, that Adam, the father of all mankind, would be considered as

supreme amongſt them, and have ſpecial honours paid him, as long as he lived; and that when his poſterity ſeparated into diſtinct families and tribes, their reſpective fathers would be acknowledged by them as their princes. For as they could not, in any tolerable manner, live together without ſome kind of government, and no government can ſubſiſt without ſome head in whom the executive power is lodged, whom were the children ſo likely, after they grew up, to acknowledge in this capacity, as their father, to whoſe authority they had been uſed to ſubmit in their early years? And hence thoſe, who were at firſt, only acknowledged as kings over their own houſholds, grew inſenſibly into monarchs of larger communities, by claiming the ſame authority over the families which branched out from them, as they had exercíſed over their own. However, the proper patriarchal government is ſuppoſed to have continued among the people of God, until the time of the Iſraelites dwelling in Egypt; for then we have the firſt intimation of a different form of government among them.

Our author hath perhaps aſſigned greater authority to the patriarchs than they reaſonably could, or did claim, and exerciſe; at leaſt, the inſtances he produces to prove they were ordinarily inveſted with ſuch a deſpotic power, "in civilibus & ſacris", as he aſcribes to them, are not ſufficiently convincing.

That there was ſome civil government in the firſt ages, is ſuppoſed to appear from the hiſtory of Cain, who was not only baniſhed, but was apprehenſive he ſhould be puniſhed with death, for the murder of his brother Abel. "And

"And Cain said unto the Lord, my punishment is greater than I can bear. Behold thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the earth; and from thy face shall I be hid, and I shall be a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth; and it shall come to pass, that every one that findeth me shall slay me (a)." Where אדמה adhamah, which we render the earth, may signify his native country, viz. that part of the world where Adam dwelt, where himself was born, and where his nearest kindred and acquaintance lived; this word, as well as ארץ arets, being frequently applied to a particular country, as to the land of Canaan (b), to the land of Egypt (c), and to several others *.

By "the face of God from which he was hid" or banished, is properly meant what the Jews called the Shechinah, a shining light or glory, in which God was wont to manifest his presence, and to present himself as a visible object of worship, and from which he gave oracles, as he did afterward in the jewish tabernacle over the mercy-seat; though St. Chrysostom understands his being "hid from the face of God," of the divine Being's withdrawing his gracious presence from him, and putting him from under his protection.

Many have thought that upon his being thus banished from the divine presence he turned idolater, and set up the worship of the sun, as the best resemblance of the Shechinah, or visible divine glory; and thus they account for

(a) Gen. iv. 13, 14. (b) Gen. xxviii. 15. (c) Exod. viii. 17.

* Vid. Stockii Clav. in verb.

the early introduction of that most general, and most ancient kind of idolatry.

The reason why this lighter punishment of banishment was inflicted on him, instead of that severer one of death, which his crime had merited, is supposed to be either, first, that he might continue a living example of divine vengeance, in order to deter others from the like crime; whereas had he been put to death, the criminal and his punishment might soon have been forgotten: or, secondly, as Grotius conceives, because there being yet but few inhabitants in the world, it was fit he should be suffered to live for the propagation of the species; or at least an example of severity was less requisite, as there were not many who were likely to be exposed to such outrages *.

However, it appears, that Cain being sensible of his deserts, was afraid the punishment of death would be inflicted on him; for he adds, "I shall be a fugitive and a vagabond on the earth; and it shall come to pass, that every one that findeth me shall slay me:" that is, either as a common enemy, or at least, as one banished and outlawed, and not under the protection of the government.

It follows, "(a) and the Lord said unto him, therefore whoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him seven-fold:" that is, as some understand it, to the seventh generation; or it may rather be a definite number for an indefinite †; and so the meaning is, he shall endure

* De jure belli et pacis, lib. 1. cap. 2. §. 5.

(a) Gen. iv. 15.

† Instances of this you have in Pſal. xii. 6. cxix. 164. and Prov. xxiv. 16. and many other places.

dure many punishments, or shall be severely punished.

"And the Lord set a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him should slay him." Many are the conjectures both of Jews and Christians (some of them ridiculous enough) concerning this mark. Some will have it, God stigmatized him with a brand in his forehead, to denote his being accursed; others, that he had a wild aspect, and bloody eyes, which rolled in a horrid manner. The fathers, in general, suppose, that he had a continual trembling of the body, so that he could hardly get his food to his mouth. This opinion is favoured by the septuagint, which renders "a fugitive and a vagabond," τρομων και τρεμων, lamenting and trembling. Others tell us, that wherever he went, the earth shook under him. And another notion, (as well founded as any of the former,) is, that he had a horn growing out of his forehead, to warn people to avoid him. Le Clerc imagines, that God ordered him to wear some distinguishing garment, perhaps of some glaring colour, as a mark or sign upon him for his preservation; like the blood upon the door posts of the Israelites houses (a); or the scarlet line in Rahab's window (b); for had he been clothed only with the skins of wild beasts, as in those days men generally were, after the fashion of their first parents (c); he would have been very liable, whenever he had wandered in the woods and thickets, to have been shot at by some hunter, and perhaps killed through mistake. A similar instance you have in the fable of Cephalus and Procis.

(a) Exod. xii. 13. (b) Josh. ii. 18. (c) Gen. iii. 21.

However, Dr. Shuckford's opinion is the most probable, who renders the words נתן יי לקין אות "God gave to Cain a sign," or token probably some apparent miracle, that he would providentially protect him, so that none that meeting should kill him. In this sense, the word אות or is used, when the rainbow is called the אות or that is, the sign, or token of the covenant which God made with Noah, whereby he assured him, that he would drown the world no more (a); and when Gideon desired, that the angel would shew him a sign, or some miraculous token, that he brought him a commission from God, and that he should be able to destroy the Midianites (b).

Another article in the history of the antediluvian ages, which is supposed to intimate, that there was a civil government then subsisting, is the story of Lamech. "Lamech said unto his wives Adah and Zillah, hear my voice ye wives of Lamech, hearken unto my speech, for I have slain a man into my wounding, and a young man to my hurt. If Cain shall be avenged seven fold, truly Lamech seventy and seven fold (c)." This speech, which is introduced without any connexion with the preceding history, has given interpreters not a little trouble. The jewish rabbies, attempt to explain it by the help of stories, perhaps, of their own invention, that Lamech, as he was hunting, being informed by a certain youth, that a wild beast lay lurking in a certain place, went thither, and unawares killed Cain, who lay in the bush of Cephalus and Procris.

(a) Shuckford's Connect. Vol. 1. p. 8.

(a) Gen. ix. 12.—17. (b) Judg. vi. 17. See also Pſal. lxxxvi. 17. (c) Gen. iv. 23, 24.

slay him there, with a dart; and then upon finding his mistake, in a fit of rage for what he had done, beat the youth to death, so that Cain slew the man he had slain by wounding him; and the youth, the young man he had killed by hurting, or beating him. But as this story is without any foundation in scripture, we have no reason to look upon it in any other light than as a meer fable, though Sir Hyde says it was received as true by several Christians. Jacobus Capellus, in his historia sacra & exotica, fancies that Lamech being in a vapoury humour, was boasting of his courage, and what he would do if there was occasion: "I would, or will, kill a man, if he wounds me, and a young man, if he hurts me." But this version offers too much violence to the Hebrew text. Onkelos, who wrote the first chaldee paraphrase on the Pentateuch, has given us an easier sense, reading the following words with an interrogation: "Have I slain a man to my wounding, and a young man to my hurt?" and accordingly he paraphrases it thus: "I have not killed a man, that I should bear the sin of it; nor have I destroyed a young man, that my offspring should be cut off for it." Dr. Shuckford has improved this interpretation, by supposing that Lamech was endeavouring to reason his wives and family out of their fear of having the death of Abel revenged upon them, who were of the posterity of Cain. As if he had said, "What have we done, that we should be afraid? We have not killed a man, nor offered any injury to our brethren of any other family; and if God would not allow Cain to be killed, who had murdered

murdered his brother, but threatned to take seven-fold vengeance on any that should kill him; doubtless they must expect much greater punishment, who should presume to kill any of us. Therefore we may surely look upon ourselves as safe under the protection of the law, and of the providence of God."

Having thus considered those parts of sacred history, which have produced us evidences of a civil government in the early ages of the world; we now proceed to examine the particular instances alledged of that despotic power of the patriarchs, which our author ascribes to them.

The first is of Noah, who pronounced a curse upon Canaan, "Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren (a)."

It may reasonably be believed, that Noah, being the second father of mankind, had, for a considerable time, the honour and authority of universal monarch, as Adam had before him. Some insist upon it, that Nimrod was the first, that drew off a party from their allegiance to Noah, and setting up for a king, proved an oppressive tyrant. Accordingly his being called גבור ציד gibbor tsayid, which the septuagint renders γιγας ενωπιον κυριου (b), may refer, not to his stature, but to his power; for Hesychius makes γιγας to signify the same as δυναστης, ισχυρος potens, robustus. Nimrod is expressly said to have set up "a kingdom (c);" and, just before (d), "to have been a mighty hunter before

(a) Gen. ix. 25. (b) Gen. x. 8. (c) ver. 10. (d) ver. 9.

before the Lord." Which the Jeruſalem-paraphraſt interprets of a ſinful hunting after the ſons of men, to turn them off from the true religion. But it may as well be taken in a more literal ſenſe, for hunting of wild beaſts; inaſmuch as the circumſtance, of his being a mighty hunter, is mentioned with great propriety, to introduce the account of his ſetting up his kingdom; the exerciſe of hunting being looked upon in antient times, as a means of acquiring the rudiments of war[a]. For which reaſon the principal heroes of heathen antiquity, as Theſeus, Neſtor, &c. were, as Xenophon tells us, bred up to hunting. Beſides, it may be ſuppoſed, that by this practiſe, Nimrod drew together a great company of robuſt young men to attend him in his ſport; and by that means increaſed his power. And by deſtroying the wild beaſts, which, in the comparatively defenceleſs ſtate of ſociety in thoſe early ages, were, no doubt, very dangerous enemies, he might perhaps render himſelf further popular; thereby engaging numbers to join with him, and to promote his chief deſign of ſubduing men, and making himſelf maſter of nations.

But to return to Noah, and to the inſtance which our author aſſigns of his patriarchal authority, in denouncing a curſe upon Canaan:

Unleſs it could be proved, that all the patriarchs were endowed with a prophetic ſpirit, as it was evident Noah was, when he foretold the fate of his three ſons and their poſterity; it

[a] Vid. Xenophon. Cyrop. lib. 1. p. 10. edit. Hutch. Philon. Jud. de Joſeph. ab initio, apud opera, p. 41. edit. Colon. Allobrog. et eundem de vita Moſis, p. 475. See theſe and other authors cited by Bochart in his Geographia Sacra, lib. 4. cap. 12.

it will by no means follow from the inſtance before us, that the authority of the patriarchs generally reached ſo far as to pronounce effectual bleſſings and curſes on their children and ſubjects. In ſhort, in this affair Noah ſeems to have acted rather as a prophet, than as a patriarch: no argument therefore can be drawn from his conduct on this occaſion, to prove the extent of the patriarchal power.

Some difficulties occur in this piece of ſacred hiſtory, which we cannot paſs over without attempting at leaſt to explain them.

II. It is inquired in what Ham's crime conſiſted?

The hiſtory informs us, that he "ſaw the nakedneſs of his father, and told his two brethren without (a)." Now merely ſeeing might be accidental, unavoidable, and no way criminal. We muſt therefore ſuppoſe there was ſomething more in the caſe than is plainly expreſſed.

Some jewiſh doctors make his crime to be caſtrating his father Noah, to prevent his having any more ſons, leſt his ſhare in the diviſion of the world ſhould not be as large as he wiſhed; which conceit ſome very grave authors have ſeriouſly refuted, from theſe words: "Noah awoke from his wine, and knew what his younger ſon had done unto him (b)." They argue, that if Ham had performed ſo painful an operation upon his father, the anguiſh would undoubtedly have awoke him, and the criminal had been taken in the very fact.

Mr. Vander Hart, profeſſor of the oriental languages in the univerſity of Helmſtad, is of opinion,

(a) Gen. ix. 22. (b) ver. 24.

opinion, that Ham's crime was committing incest with his father's wife. But if we may suppose the narrations of Moſes to be thus diſguiſed, there will be hardly any depending upon a ſingle fact he relates. The moſt probable, therefore, as well as the eaſieſt account is this, that Ham told his brethren of what he had ſeen in a ſcornful manner. It is ſaid, "he told his brethren without;" perhaps in the ſtreet, publickly before the people, proclaiming his father's ſhame with contempt and deriſion; the very ſin to which ſuch exemplary vengeance was afterwards threatned: "The eye that mocketh at his father, and deſpiſeth to obey his mother, the ravens of the valley ſhall pick it out, and the young eagles ſhall eat it (a)."

2dly, It is inquired, why Noah denounced the curſe, not on Ham himſelf, but on his ſon Cainan (b).

It might very likely be a reaſon, why Cainan is here ſo particularly mentioned by Moſes, that hereby the Iſraelites might be incouraged to war againſt the Canaanites, who were the poſterity of this Cainan; when they knew, that by a curſe they were devoted to ſubjection and ſlavery; and that, on this account, they might be aſſured of victory over them.

But as to the reaſon of the curſe's being denounced on Cainan:

1ſt. Some by Cainan underſtand Cainan's father; which is a very harſh interpretation.

2dly, The opinion of the hebrew doctors is, that Cainan firſt ſaw Noah in an indecent poſture, and made a jeſt of it to his father Ham. For

(a) Prov. xxx. 17. (b) Gen. ix. 25.

For proof of this they alledge the words already quoted, "Noah awoke from his wine, and knew what his younger son had done unto him (a)." By "younger son," which we render Noah's younger son, (filius parvus,) they understand his grandson. But this also is too forced an interpretation. For as בן גדול magnus, is elsewhere applied to Japhet, to signify his being the elder (b), so בן קטן parvus, is most naturally, in this place, to be understood of the younger son.

2dly, The easiest solution of this difficulty, I conceive, is this, that what is commonly called a curse, in this place, is rather a prophecy. So that the words, "cursed be Canaan (c)," would better be rendered, "cursed shall Canaan be," that is, the posterity of Canaan, who from him were called Canaanites; for the blessings, which Noah emphatically pronounced upon his two other sons, related to their posterity; as is evident from the following words, "God shall enlarge Japhet, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem (d). Now though the Canaanites suffered for their own sins (e), yet it was a present punishment inflicted upon Ham, to be informed by the spirit of prophecy, that one branch of his posterity would prove so exceeding vile, as to fall remarkably under the curse of God, and be made a slave to the posterity of his brethren. Which leads us to inquire,

3dly, What is meant by his being a "servant of servants?" "Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren!" This

(a) ver. 24. (b) Gen. x. 21. (c) Gen. ix. 25.
(d) ver. 27. (e) Lev. xviii. 24, 25. and Gen. xv. 16.

This may eaſily be determined from the uſe of the like phraſe on other occaſions. Sanctum ſanctorum ſignified the moſt holy place in the jewiſh tabernacle and temple; and canticum canticorum, the moſt excellent ſong. In like manner ſervus ſervorum, a ſervant of ſervants, is the baſeſt and vileſt of ſervants, that is, a ſlave: and very remarkably was the prediction fulfilled eight hundred years after, when the Iſraelites, who were deſcended from Shem, took poſſeſſion of the land of Canaan, ſubduing thirty kings, killing a vaſt number of the inhabitants, laying heavy tributes on the remainder, or driving them out of their country, and uſing the Gibeonites, who ſaved themſelves by a wile, though not properly as ſlaves, yet as meer drudges for the ſervice of the tabernacle; and when afterwards, the ſcattered relicks of the Canaanites, at Tyre, at Thebes and at Carthage, were all conquered and cut off by the Greeks and Romans, who were deſcended from Japhet *.

The ſecond inſtance which Godwin produces, of the deſpotic power of the patriarchs, is Abraham's turning Hagar and Iſhmael out of his family (a):

When Abraham left his father's houſe, and came into the land of Canaan, being there ſui juris, and ſubject to none, he doubtleſs exerciſed a patriarchal juriſdiction in his own family; in which he was ſucceeded by Iſaac and Jacob. But as for his turning his concubine and

* See Philippi Olearii diſputat. hiſtorico-moral. de Cham. maledict. Lips. 1707. & apud Theſaur. nov. theologico-philolog. tom. 1. p. 168. Lugd. Bat. & Amſtel. 1732.

(a) Gen. xxi. 9, &c.

nary zeal againſt idolatry in the affair of the golden calf (*a*), the curſe was taken off, or rather, turned into a bleſſing (*b*); for it was conſecrated of God to "teach Jacob his judgments, and Iſrael his laws (*c*); and the Levites had the tenth of all the increaſe of the land aſſigned them, throughout all the country.

The fourth inſtance of patriarchal authority, which is alledged, is of Judah; who, when he was informed, that Tamar, his daughter-in-law, had played the harlot, and was with child by whoredom, ſaid, "Bring her forth and let her be burnt (*d*)." From whence it is inferred, that Judah, as a patriarch, was inveſted with ſupream authority in his own houſe, and even with power of life and death. But to this it is objected,

1ſt. It is not probable, that Judah ſhould be inveſted with ſuch authority, while his father Jacob was ſtill living: much leſs,

2dly, That he ſhould have ſuch a deſpotic power over Tamar, who was not one of his family; for after the death of Onan, ſhe had returned to dwell in her own father's houſe (*e*); nor

3dly, If he had poſſeſſed ſuch a power, is it likely he would have been guilty of ſo much injuſtice and cruelty, as to put her to death, when ſhe was with child. Perhaps therefore Judah might ſpeak only as a proſecutor: "Bring her forth, to her trial, in order that ſhe may be burnt after her delivery." For though the law of Moſes, which enacted that adultery

(*a*) Exod. xxxii. 26,—28. (*b*) ver. 29. (*c*) Deut. xxxiii. 9, 10. (*d*) Gen. xxxviii. 24. (*e*) ver. 11.

ſhould be puniſhed with death (*a*), was not yet given, burning ſeems, however, to have been the puniſhment of that crime, which cuſtom had eſtabliſhed. We find it practiſed by the Philiſtines, who were not under the law of Moſes. When Samſon's wife had married another man, "they burnt her with fire (*b*)." It is further to be conſidered, that though Tamar had lived a widow, ſince the death of Onan; yet ſhe was legally eſpouſed to his younger brother Selah, and only waited till he was of proper age, for the conſummation of the marriage; and therefore ſhe was conſidered as a wife, and conſequently as an adultereſs.

Of the ſpecial form of the hebrew government.

Having thus examined the hints of the patriarchal form of government, which are to be found in the only authentic hiſtory of thoſe early ages; we proceed

II. To conſider the ſpecial government of the people of Iſrael, from the beginning of their national polity to its final diſſolution. Here I ſhall diſtinguiſh this large tract of time into four periods;

1ſt. From their entrance into Egypt to their entrance into Canaan.

2dly, From their entrance into Canaan to the captivity.

3dly, During the captivity, and

4thly, From the captivity to the deſtruction of Jeruſalem.

I. The

(*a*) Lev. xx. 10. (*b*) Judg. xv. 6.

I. The firſt period is, from their entrance into Egypt to their entrance into Canaan; which may conveniently be ſubdivided into two leſſer periods.

The former takes up the time of their ſojourning in the land of Egypt; the latter, the time of their migration through the wilderneſs, from Egypt to Canaan.

Firſt, as to the ſtate and form of their government, while they ſojourned in Egypt.

No doubt, while Jacob and Joſeph lived, they were their own maſters, and were governed by their own laws. And though afterwards, "when another king aroſe, that knew not Joſeph," they were enſlaved by the Egyptians; yet we may perhaps diſcern the ſhadow, at leaſt, of ſome form of civil govetrnment, ſtill ſubſiſting among them.

God commanded Moſes to "gather the זִקְנֵי zikenim, elders of Iſrael together, in order to deliver to them the meſſage, with which he was ſent to their nation (*a*)." And "Moſes and Aaron went, and gathered together all the elders of the children of Iſrael (*b*)."

By elders ſome underſtand the judges in their civil courts; becauſe we find this title, afterwards, applied to ſuch judges (*c*). But it is an objection of no ſmall weight againſt this opinion, that when Moſes had brought the Iſraelites out of Egypt, there were no ſuch judges among them; but Moſes judged all himſelf, to his exceeding great trouble (*d*). By the elders, therefore, ſpoken of before during their

(*a*) Exod. iii. 16. (*b*) chap. iv. 29. (*c*) Deut. xxi. 2. xix. 12. and in ſeveral other places. (*d*) Exod. xviii. 13, &c.

abode in Egypt, may only be meant the wiſeſt and graveſt men, in the higheſt eſteem among them, or at moſt, according to Mr. Selden, the heads of their tribes *.

As for the שטרים ſhoterim, officers of the children of Iſrael (a), which they had amongſt them at this time, they ſeem to have been appointed, and ſet over them, by the Egyptians, meerly for the purpoſe of overſeeing the work they were employed in.

So that, upon the whole, we have only very dark and uncertain hints of any ſpecial form of government among the Hebrews, during their abode in Egypt. But

Secondly, The form of their government is far more conſpicuous in, and during, their migration, through the wilderneſs, from Egypt to Canaan.

Preſently after they had left Egypt, the Theocracy was ſet up among them, that is, God condeſcended to be their king, as well as their God. The word θεοκρατια, formed by Joſephus from θεος Deus, and κρατεω impero, very happily expreſſeth that peculiar government, which God exerciſed over the people of Iſrael. To them he ſtood in a threefold relation,

Firſt, As their Creator, in common with the reſt of mankind; and therefore, as the Lord of their conſciences, he required from them all the duties of the moral law.

Secondly, He was their God, as they were a viſible church, ſeparated from all the nations of the earth to be his peculiar people. In this character he preſcribed the peculiar forms and diſtinguiſh-

* Uxor Hebr. lib. 1. cap. 15.

(a) Exod. v. 14.

diſtinguiſhing rites and ceremonies of their religious worſhip.

Thirdly, He was their proper king, the ſovereign of their body politic; in which character he gave them judicial or political laws, relating to government and civil life; he ordered a royal palace to be built for his reſidence among them; I mean the tabernacle, in which he dwelt, or manifeſted his ſpecial preſence, by the Shechinah, as the Jews call it; that is, by a bright cloud or glory, appearing over the mercy ſeat, betwixt the two cherubim in the innermoſt room of that palace (*a*); on which account he is ſaid to "dwell betwixt the cherubim (*b*);" and to "ſit betwixt the cherubim (*c*). From thence he gave forth oracles, or ſignified his will concerning matters of importance to the ſtate, which were not determined by the body of written laws (*d*).

It ſhould ſeem, the common way of giving theſe oracles was by an audible voice. In this manner, we are expreſsly informed, the oracle was given to Moſes, when he went into the tabernacle to conſult it (*e*). And it may be inferred from the phraſe by which the oracle is uſually expreſſed; "Jehovah ſpoke ſaying," or "Jehovah ſaid."

However that was, (which will be conſidered more fully in its proper place) it ſufficiently appears, that by the oracle, or by Jehovah himſelf, all laws were enacted, war was proclaimed, and magiſtrates were appointed; in which three things the ſumma poteſtas, or ſovereign authority, of any ſtate, conſiſteth *.

(*a*) Lev. xvi. 2. (*b*) Pſal. lxxx. 1. (*c*) Pſal. xcix. 1. (*d*) Lev. i. 1. (*e*) Numb. vii. 89.

* Vid. Conring. de Rep. Heb. §. 7, & ſeq.

1ſt. Laws were enacted, and promulged immediately by the oracle, or voice of Jehovah.

Thus, when the laws of the two tables were given at mount Sinai, the voice of Jehovah was heard by all the people (*a*). But the majeſty in which God manifeſted himſelf on that occaſion, was ſo very awful, that it ſtruck them with amazement, and a kind of horror; therefore the reſt of the laws were, at their requeſt, communicated more privately to Moſes, and by him to the people. Yet they were all given, immediately, by the oracle, or voice of Jehovah. "The Lord ſpake unto Moſes, ſaying," is the uſual preface to every body, or parcel, of laws.

Now theſe laws are an evidence, that Jehovah acted as their king, as well as their God; ſince they contain a number of forenſic, as well as moral and ceremonial precepts, relating to their civil polity and government, to their magiſtrates and judges, their eſtates and inheritances, their trade and commerce; and even to the form of their houſes, their food, and their apparel. God enacted all their laws, and no power was veſted in any one elſe, either to make new, or repeal old ones.

2dly, God, as king, reſerved to himſelf the ſovereign right of proclaiming war, and making peace, with their neighbouring nations.

He proclaimed war with the Amalekites (*b*), and with the Midianites (*c*); and therefore a certain hiſtory of the wars of the Iſraelites, now loſt, is called "the book of the wars of the Lord (*d*)." Jehovah commanded, and even headed, their

(*a*) Deut. v. 22, 23. (*b*) Exod. xvii. 16. (*c*) Numb. xxxi. 1, 2. (*d*) Numb. xxi. 14.

their armies, in their marches, and in their battles. Thus the tabernacle, or royal tent, led their marches through the wilderneſs; from thence, by the riſing and falling of a miraculous cloud over it, was the ſignal given, when they ſhould proceed, and when they ſhould reſt (*a*). By this extraordinary appearance or token of the divine preſence, was the courſe, as well as the time, of their marches directed; for "the Lord went before them by day in a pillar of a cloud, to lead them the way; and by night in a pillar of fire, to give them light to go by day and night (*b*)." To theſe miraculous ſignals thoſe words of Moſes refer, "When the ark ſet forward, Moſes ſaid, Riſe up, Lord, and let thine enemies be ſcattered; and let them that hate thee, flee before thee. And when it reſted, he ſaid, Return, O Lord, unto the many thouſands of Iſrael (*c*)."

We may remark by the way, with Taubman in his notes on Virgil, that it proceeded, probably, from a tradition of this uſual appearance of the God of Iſrael, that the heathen poets frequently repreſent their deities as appearing in a cloud, with a peculiar brightneſs in it.

Now, God himſelf undertaking to lead their marches, it was great preſumption in them ever to march without his ſignal or order; and when therefore they would thus have marched into Canaan, Moſes ſharply expoſtulates with them, "Wherefore now do you tranſgreſs the commandment of the Lord? But it ſhall not proſper. Go not up, for the Lord is not among you, that ye be not ſmitten before your ene-

(*a*) Numb. ix. 17, 18. (*b*) Exod. xiii. 21.
(*c*) Numb. x. 35, 36.

mies (a):" Which words ſuggeſt a ſufficient reaſon of their being ſometimes defeated, though Jehovah himſelf was their king and general.

The whole direction of the ſiege of Jericho, and the manner of taking it (b), are a further illuſtrious inſtance of Jehovah's immediate conduct of their military affairs.

3dly, God, in his royal capacity, appointed all officers in the ſtate. Thus he made Moſes his viceroy or prime miniſter; and Joſhua not only the ſucceſſor of Moſes after his death, but an aſſociate with him, or his deputy and lieutenant, during his life. For ſo Dr. Patrick underſtands that order, which God gave to Moſes concerning Joſhua, "Thou ſhalt put ſome of thine honour upon him, that all the congregation of the children of Iſrael may be obedient (c)." Onkelos, indeed, and the hebrew doctors underſtand by the word הוד hod, which we render "honour" in that place, (but which more commonly ſignifies glory,) the ſplendor which ſhone in the face of Moſes, after he came down from the mount; part of which, they ſuppoſed, was now imparted to Joſhua, in order to make him appear more venerable in the eyes of the people. Upon which, they ſay, Moſes's face ſhone like the ſun, Joſhua's like the moon. But they ſhould have obſerved, that MOSES is ordered to put ſome of his glory or honour upon Joſhua; which cannot be underſtood, with any propriety, of that miraculous luſtre which Moſes had no power to impart; but may, very naturally, be interpreted of the honour reſulting from his authority, and poſt in the government, in

(a) Numb. xiv. 41, 42. (b) Joſh. vi. (c) Numb. xxvii. 20.

in which Joſhua was now to be joined with him.

We further obſerve, to this purpoſe, that when Jethro ſuggeſted to Moſes, that, for his eaſe in the government, he ſhould appoint a number of inferior officers under him, he (being doubtleſs informed by Moſes of the extraordinary conſtitution of the hebrew ſtate) did not propoſe he ſhould do it without a ſpecial order from Jehovah, but that he ſhould conſult the oracle: "If thou ſhalt do this thing, and God command thee ſo, then thou ſhalt be able to endure, &c. (*a*)" And thus likewiſe, when any doubt aroſe about the meaning of any law, which God had already given; or when any caſe occurred, which the law had not expreſsly provided for; Jehovah himſelf muſt be conſulted about it. As in the caſe of thoſe, who were defiled by a dead body; and therefore could not keep the paſſover on the day appointed (*b*); in the caſe of the ſabbath breaker (*c*); and of Zelophehad's daughter, about the right of inheritance (*d*). From which inſtances it plainly appears, that God ſtood in the peculiar relation to the Iſraelites, of their king, as well as their God. When, therefore, they afterwards deſired a king "to judge them like the other nations;" God ſays, they had "rejected him that he ſhould not reign over them (*e*)." And Samuel upbraids them with this their rebellion: "Ye ſaid a king ſhall reign over us; when the Lord your God was your king (*f*);" that is, in the ſame ſenſe in which the kings of other nations are their kings; otherwiſe, the deſiring

(*a*) Exod. xviii. 23. (*b*) Numb. ix. 6,—10. (*c*) Numb. xv. 34. 35. (*d*) Numb. xxvii. 5,—7. (*e*) 1 Sam. viii. 7. (*f*) 1 Sam. xii. 12.

firing an earthly king would not have been inconsistent with the sovereignty of Jehovah, and their allegiance to him.

Since, then, Jehovah himself was the king, as well as the God, of Israel; it follows, that the priests and levites, who were the more immediate and stated attendants on his presence, in the royal tent or palace, as the tabernacle or temple may be stiled; and to whom the execution of the law was, in many cases, committed; were properly ministers of state and of civil government, as well as of religion. Thus, to them it belonged, to declare, who were clean, and who were unclean; who should be shut out of the congregation, and who should be admitted into it. The people were to enquire of the law from their mouth, and that in respect to civil as well as to religious matters; and they were appointed to teach Jacob God's judgments, and Israel his laws; "even all the statutes, which the Lord hath spoken unto them, by the hand of Moses (a);" that is, the forensic laws, as well as the moral and ceremonial precepts.

Hence we are naturally led to conceive of a double use of the sacrifices, which were offered by the priests in behalf, and at the charge, of the people; of which they had a share, as the perquisites of their office: I mean, that besides their typical and religious use, they were also intended for the support of the state, and civil government; inasmuch as these ministers of state were chiefly maintained by them. So that the allotments to the priests, out of the sacrifices, may be considered as designed, like the civil

(a) Lev. x. 11.

civil-liſt-money in other nations, for the immediate ſupport of the crown, and the officers of ſtate.

On theſe principles we are enabled to account for Paul's ſacrificing, as we are informed he did, after the commencement of the chriſtian diſpenſation (*a*): an action, which has been ſeverely cenſured by ſome, as the greateſt error of his life. Hereby he not only gave, ſay they, too much countenance to the jews, in their ſuperſtitious adherence to the law of Moſes, after it was abrogated by Chriſt; but his offering theſe typical ſacrifices, after the antitype of them was accompliſhed in the ſacrifice of Chriſt, was a virtual denial of Chriſt, and of the virtue of his ſacrifice, which ſuperſeded all others. Paul's long trouble, which began immediately after this affair, ſome have looked upon as a judgment of God upon him for this great offence. But if this action was really ſo criminal as ſome ſuppoſe, one cannot enough wonder, that ſo good, and ſo wiſe a man as Paul was, ſhould be guilty of it; and that the apoſtle James, and the other chriſtian elders, ſhould all adviſe him to it (*b*). It is likewiſe ſtrange, that we find no cenſure ever paſſed on this action by any of the ſacred writers; not even by Paul himſelf, who appears ſo ready, on other occaſions, to acknowledge, and humble himſelf for his errors and failings. On the contrary, he reflects with comfort on his having complied with the cuſtoms of the Jews, in order to remove their prejudice againſt him and his miniſtry, and againſt the goſpel which he preached, and to

(*a*) Acts xxi. 26. (*b*) ver. 18, 23, 24.

to win them over to embrace it: "Unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; and this I do for the goſpel's ſake (*a*).

To elucidate this point, we are to conſider, that there was a political, as well as typical, uſe of ſacrifices; and that though the typical ceaſed upon the ſacrifice of Chriſt, yet the political continued, till God in his providence broke up the jewiſh ſtate and polity, about forty years after our Saviour's death. Till that time, it was not merely lawful, but matter of duty, for good ſubjects to pay the dues which were appointed by law for the ſupport of the government and magiſtracy. Now of this kind was the ſacrifice which Paul offered; and in this view, they were paid by Chriſtians, dwelling in Judea, as well as by thoſe who ſtill adhered to the jewiſh religion. So that, upon the whole, this action, for which Paul has been ſo much cenſured, probably amounts to nothing more than paying the tribute due to the magiſtrate by law; which the apoſtle enjoins upon all other Chriſtians in all other nations (*b*).

From this account of the Theocracy, and of the peculiar relations in which God ſtood to the hebrew nation, we may alſo perceive, in what ſenſe, and how far, the levitical ſacrifices could make atonement for ſin. This they are often ſaid to do; and yet it is aſſerted in the epiſtle to the Hebrews (*c*), "that it is not poſſible, that the blood of bulls, and of goats ſhould take away ſins;" that is, ſins againſt God as our Creator and the Lord of conſcience. But, beſides

(*a*) 1 Cor. ix. 20, 23. (*b*) Rom. xiii. 6. (*c*) chap. x. 4.

ſides the typical reference, which the jewiſh ſacrifices had to the great atonement by the ſacrifice of Chriſt, they may be ſuppoſed to make a proper and equitable atonement for tranſgreſſions of the peculiar law of the Theocracy, or for ſins committed againſt God, meerly as king of the Jews. It is enacted in the law of Moſes (*a*), that if a perſon "had committed a treſpaſs, and ſinned through ignorance, in the holy things of the Lord;" (that is, by applying to his own private uſe, what ſhould have been paid to God as king, or to the prieſts his miniſters,) he ſhould make amends to the full value in money; adding to it a fifth part more, and a ram for a treſpaſs offering; with which the prieſt ſhould make atonement for him, and it ſhould be forgiven him. Now in the caſe of a ſin of ignorance, this might well be deemed an equitable and full compenſation, and ſo a proper atonement for the ſin, or treſpaſs. But if this, or any other treſpaſs, was committed preſumptuouſly, that is, wilfully and audaciouſly, in contempt of the divine majeſty, and his authority; that circumſtance rendered it a ſin againſt God, as the Lord of conſcience; for which therefore no brutal ſacrifices could atone; but it is ſaid, "That ſoul ſhall be cut off from among his people (*b*)."

We have only further to obſerve, upon this form of government, which was peculiar to the Hebrews, that as God himſelf was their king, ſo Moſes was his viceroy, in whom the ſupream, eccleſiaſtical as well as civil power, under God, was lodged. By him Aaron, and his

(*a*) Lev. v. 15, 16. (*b*) Numb. xv. 30.

his sons, were put into the priesthood; the royal palace, or tabernacle, was built by his direction; by him it was consecrated; he gave the nation the whole body of their laws; he was commander in chief of all their forces. All this did Moses by commission from God, or rather God did it by Moses. So that, though the servant of God, yet, as chief among men, he is called king in Jeshurun (a). For though government by kings, properly so called, was not set up till the days of Saul; yet the title was more ancient, and given to persons of high rank and great authority, though they were never crowned, never attended with royal pomp, nor invested with the regalia; in particular it was applied to the judges. When Abimelech was made judge in Shechem, it is said, they made him king (b); and when there was no judge in Israel, it is said, "there was no king (c)." Thus, in after ages, the roman dictators likewise, to whom Godwin compares the hebrew judges, are sometimes called kings, both by the latin and greek historians. It is not, therefore, difficult to account for Moses's being called king, though he was only God's lieutenant or viceroy.

But it is not so easy to account for Israel's being called Jeshurun. Some derive the word from יָשָׁר jashar, rectus, just or righteous; and so make it to signify a righteous people. Montanus renders it rectitudo, and so does the Samaritan version. But it seems a considerable objection against this sense, that Israel is called Jeshurun, at the very time that they are upbraided

(a) Deut. xxxiii. 5. (b) Judg. ix. 6. (c) Judg. xvii. 6.

braided with their ſins and their rebellion, "Jeſhurun waxed fat, and kicked, &c. (a) It is replied, Jeſhurun is the diminutive of ישר jaſhar (for "nomen auctum in fine eſt nomen diminutivum,") and ſo imports, that though, in general and on the whole, they were a righteous people, yet they were not without great faults.

Perhaps Cocceius has given as probable an interpretation as any. He derives the word from שור ſhur, which ſignifies to ſee, behold or diſcover; from whence, in the future tenſe plural, comes ישורו jeſhuru, which, with the addition of Nun paragogicum, makes Jeſhurun; that is, the people who had the viſion of God *. This makes the name Jeſhurun to be properly applied to Iſrael, not only when Moſes is called their king, but when they are upbraided with their rebellion againſt God; ſince the peculiar manifeſtation, which God had made of himſelf to them, was a great aggravation of their ingratitude and rebellion. We now proceed to the

Second period of the hebrew hiſtory; which commences with their entrance into Canaan under the command of Joſhua, and expires at the long captivity.

Joſhua, the ſucceſſor of Moſes, and captain general of Iſrael, was of the tribe of Ephraim. His original name was הושע Hoſheang (b). It was changed by Moſes, no doubt, by God's command, into יהושע Jehoſhuang (c). Now ſince both theſe names ſignify the ſame, namely, a ſaviour; from ישע jaſhang, ſalvavit, he hath

(a) Deut. xxxii. 15. * Ultima Moſis, §. 973.
(b) Numb. xiii. 8. (c) ver. 16.

hath saved; it is enquired, for what reason his name was thus changed? To account for this, two conjectures are offered;

First, that it was in order to put an honour upon him, by adding one of the letters of the name of Jehovah to his name; as God changed Abram's name into אַבְרָהָם Abraham; adding ה to it, from his own name, say the Jews (a). Thus יְהוֹשֻׁעַ Jehoshuang, may signify salvator Dei; and he was made even in his name a more eminent type of Christ, who bore the same name with him, Jesus or Joshua; and who is called (b) σωτηρ του θεου, "the salvation of God *." But if this reason for the change of Joshua's name be thought too cabbalistical,

The second may, perhaps, be more satisfactory; viz. that the name יְהוֹשֻׁעַ Hosheang comes from the imperative of hiphil, and signifies, save; and perhaps his parents, by giving it, meant to express their wish, that he might prove a saviour to Israel. But יְהוֹשֻׁעַ Jehoshuang comes from the future tense, and signifies salvabit, will save. So that Moses, by making this change, predicted and promised what his parents had wished.

Joshua had been Moses's minister (c), and had attended upon him in his highest employments. When he was called up by Jehovah into the mount, to receive the two tables of the law; it is said, that "Moses rose up, and his minister Joshua (d)." And he is said "to stand before Moses (e)," not surely as a menial servant, but as his first minister; for Joshua was one of the heads of the children of Israel, and a ruler

(a) Gen. xvii. 5. (b) Luke iii. 6. * Vid. Alting. de Cabalist. (c) Josh. i. 1. (d) Exod. xxiv. 13. (e) Deut. i. 38.

a ruler in his tribe; as were all the twelve spies, whom Moses sent to search out the land of Canaan, of which number Joshua was (*a*). He only and Caleb brought a good and true report of that land, encouraging the people to invade it, and assuring them of success (*b*); while the other ten gave such a discouraging account of the gigantic stature and valour of the inhabitants, of the number and strength of their fortified towns, and perhaps also of the unhealthiness of their country, (which seems to be their meaning in saying, that "the land eateth up the inhabitants thereof (*c*),") that the people were disheartened, and inclined to make themselves a captain, and return into Egypt (*d*). God was, hereupon, so much displeased, because they shewed such ingratitude and infidelity, notwithstanding the many wonders he had wrought for them in Egypt, and in the desart, and notwithstanding the repeated assurances he had given them of the conquest of Canaan, that he sentenced all of them who were twenty years of age and upwards, except Caleb and Joshua, to wander in the wilderness for forty years, till they were consumed; that none of them might enter into the promised land. And as for those, to whose false reports this rebellion was owing, they were all destroyed by a sudden death (*e*). But as for Joshua, he not only lived till the Israelites entered into the land of Canaan, but had the honour, as their captain general, to conduct them. He had before been appointed Moses's successor by the oracle, or by

(*a*) Numb. xiii. 2, 3, 8. (*b*) Numb. xiv. 6,—9. (*c*) Numb. xiii. 32. (*d*) Numb. xiv. 2,—4. (*e*) ver. 36, 37.

Jehovah himself; and had been solemnly ordained to that office, while Moses was living (a). And after his death the people acknowledged him for his successor, promising to pay him the same obedience, which they had paid to Moses (b). However, though he succeeded Moses, as God's viceroy or lieutenant, and had the same authority, military and civil, which his predecessor had; yet, in some respects, he was much inferior to him; and therefore he could not be "that prophet, like unto Moses, whom God had promised to raise up unto his brethren (c)," as the modern Jews affirm, and some Christians have too easily granted, he was. For, besides that he had not the honour of being a lawgiver, as Moses had, (by whom the whole body of laws, which God intended for his people, was delivered,) I say, besides this, he was never admitted to that immediate and familiar manner of conversing with God, with which Moses was favoured; for "with him the Lord spake face to face, as a man speaks to his friend (d);" whereas when Joshua wanted to consult the oracle, he was to stand before the priest, who should ask counsel for him after the judgment of Urim (e)." In both these respects, neither Joshua, nor any other prophet, was "like unto Moses;" except He to whom that prophecy is applied by the apostle Peter (f), and in whom alone it was accomplished, even our Lord Jesus Christ.

Our author says, that after Joshua succeeded Judges. But it may be questioned, whether the judges were properly successors to Joshua, in

(a) Numb. xxvii. 15,—23. (b) Josh. i. 16, 17.
(c) Deut. xviii. 15. (d) Exod. xxxiii. 11. (e) Numb. xxvii. 21. (f) Acts iii. 20,—22.

in the ſame office, as he had been to Moſes. For, as the law had been given by Moſes, and as the land of Canaan had been conquered, and the tribes of Iſrael ſettled in the peaceable poſſeſſion of their inheritances, by Joſhua; there ſeems to have been no further occaſion for "a man to be ſet over the congregation, who might go out before them, and who might go in before them, and who might lead them out, and who might bring them in;" which was the office of Joſhua (a). As therefore the legiſlative office, which Moſes had poſſeſſed, expired at his death, ſo did the office of Joſhua, as præfectus ordinarius, and captain general for life, at his. Hereupon the hebrew government became ariſtocratical, excepting that, in reſpect to the peculiar ſupremacy of Jehovah, it was monarchical *.

In the hebrew commonwealth every city had its elders, who formed a court of judicature, with a power of determining leſſer matters in their reſpective diſtricts. The rabbies ſay, there were three ſuch elders, or judges, in each leſſer city, and twenty-three in greater. But Joſephus ſpeaks of ſeven judges in each, without

(a) Numb. xxvii. 16, 17.

* Ariſtocracy (ſo called from ἄριστος, optimus, & κρατεῖν, impero,) imports that the ſupream government is lodged in the optimates, or nobles. Such is the preſent form of government in Venice, and in Holland. Democracy, (from δῆμος, populus & κρατεῖν, impero) means that the ſupream authority is in the people, who exerciſe it by perſons of their own order. Such is the government of Baſil, and of ſome of the free cities of Germany. Monarchy, (from μόνος, ſolus, & ἀρχή, imperium,) is when the ſupream authority is lodged in a ſingle perſon, as in France and Spain. The Engliſh conſtitution is plainly a mixture of all three, inaſmuch as the ſupream authority is lodged jointly in the king, the lords and the commons.

any such distinction of greater or less *. We often read, in scripture, of the elders of the cities; but the number of them is not determined; probably that was left discretional. For instance, we read of the elders of Gilead, who went to fetch Jephthah, and make him their captain (c); of the elders of Succoth (d); and of the elders of Bethlehem, where Boaz lived (e). In short, that there were elders in every city, appears from the law, directing and regulating the conduct of the elders of any city, on occasion of a person's being found dead in, or near it (f). Sigonius † supposes, these elders and judges of cities were the original constitution formed in the wilderness by Moses, upon the advice which Jethro gave him (g); and continued by divine appointment, after the settlement in the land of Canaan. Whereas others imagine the jethronian prefectures were a peculiar constitution, suited to their condition while encamped in the wilderness; but laid aside after they came into Canaan. However that be, it is certain there was a court of judges and officers, appointed in every city by the law of Moses (f). How far, and in what respects, these judges differed from the elders of the city, is not easily determined; and whether they were different persons, or the same. Perhaps the title, elders, may denote their seniority and dignity; and that of judges, the office they sustained.

As for the officers, שטרים shoterim, mentioned along with the judges, ‡ they were, according

* Antiq. lib iv. cap. 8. §. 14. edit. Havere.
(c) Judg. xi. 5, 6. (d) Judg. viii. 14. (e) Ruth iv. 2, 4, 9. compared with chap. i. 1. (f) Deut. xxi. 1,—9. † De Repub. Heb. lib. vi. cap. 6.
(g) Exod. xviii. 21, 22. (f) Deut. xvi. 18.
‡ See Patrick on the text last cited.

cording to the account given of them by Maimonides and the rabbins, much like those, whom the roman law calls, officiales & executores, and the New Testament, ὑπηρέτας (a); who attended the court, to keep the people in order, with a staff and a whip; and to execute the orders and decrees of the judges. Josephus stiles them * bailiffs or officers, under the judges; and we find them, on some occasions, employed as publick cryers (b). However the rabbies place them next under their wise men and doctors, and above their scribes or clerks. And indeed they seem to have been persons of some consideration, by Joshua's assembling them along with the elders, heads, and judges; not to hold any court of justice, but to hear his farewell charge and exhortation before his death (c).

The lower courts of justice, in their several cities, were held in their gates: "Judges and officers shalt thou make in all thy gates (d)." The gate among the Hebrews seems to answer to the forum among the Romans, and to the ἀγορὰ among the Greeks; which was the name given to any common place of resort, whether for the keeping of markets, or the holding courts of judicature. In the former sense the word, gate, is used, when Elisha foretells at what low rates provisions would be sold, on the morrow, in the gate of Samaria (e). According to the latter sense, Israel is exhorted to "execute the judgment of truth and peace in her gates (f);" and so in the law we are now

(a) Luke xii 58. * Ubi supra. See also Matt. v. 25. where ὑπηρέτης is used in the same sense, as it is by Josephus. (b) Deut. xx. 5, 8, 9. Josh. i. 10, 11. (c) Josh. xxiii. 2. xxiv. 1. (d) Deut. xvi. 18. (e) 2 Kings vii. 1. (f) Zech. viii. 16.

explaining, they are commanded to "make judges and officers in their gates." In either sense, that is, as denoting, in general, a place of public concourse, the word is used, when it is said of the virtuous woman, "Give her of the fruit of her hands, and let her own works praise her in the gates (a)."

Each tribe had its respective prince. They are called the heads of the thousands of Israel (b); and were the same, perhaps, with the twelve captains of the host, mentioned in the second chapter of Numbers; and their office, therefore related chiefly, if not entirely, to military affairs.

We read also of the princes of the congregation, who presided in judiciary matters (c). These probably were the same with the jethronian prefectures, of whom we spake before, and who are called elders, and also princes and nobles, on account of the dignity of their office (d). They were in number seventy, as appears by the account of their institution, which we have in the book of Numbers (e); though I rather apprehend that to be an account of their being confirmed in their office, and perhaps invested with some additional authority, and endowed with some miraculous gift to qualify them for it; for we find there were seventy elders before, at the time of giving the law at mount Sinai (f).

Whether this consistory of seventy elders was a perpetual, or only a temporary institution, is a matter of dispute. The Jews, and after them Grotius,

(a) Prov. xxxi. 31. (b) Numb. x. 4. (c) Numb. xxxii. 2. Josh. ix. 15. xvii. 4. (d) Exod. xxiv. 9, 11. (e) chap. xi. 16, 17, 24, 25. (f) Exod. xxiv. 1, 9, 14.

Grotius, Selden, Lightfoot, and several other Christians, have affirmed, it was the same that became afterwards so famous under the name of the Sanhedrim; to which even their kings and high priests were subject. But others conceive the institution of the seventy elders was only temporary, for the assistance of Moses in the government, before the settlement in the land of Canaan; and that the Sanhedrim was first set up in the time of the Maccabees.

On the former side, the rabbies are zealous assertors of the high antiquity of the Sanhedrim; and though they allow, that its session was sometimes interrupted and discontinued for years together, especially in the times of the kings; they leave no stone unturned, to prove that the court, nevertheless, subsisted from the time of Moses.

The first argument they produce is taken from this passage in the book of Numbers (*a*), "The Lord said unto Moses, gather unto me seventy of the elders of Israel." Which the Talmud interprets, that "they may be a Sanhedrim to my land;" that is, a holy, standing, perpetual council, throughout all generations. For wherever we meet with the word לי, unto me, the rabbies think it signifies a thing established by God to all generations. For instance, when he says of Aaron and his sons, "They shall minister unto me in the priest's office (*b*);" and of the Levites, "They shall be mine," or unto me (*c*); and of the whole nation, "Unto me the children of Israel are servants (*d*);" and when the like is said of the sanctuary, the sacrifices, the altar and many

(*a*) chap. xi. 16. (*b*) Exod. xxviii. 41. (*c*) Numb. iii. 12. (*d*) Lev. xxv. 55.

other things; in all these cases, they understand the word עד li, to import a perpetual institution.

2dly, It is argued, that if Moses needed the assistance of such a council, much more was it requisite after his death; and it is by no means probable, that any one would presume to abrogate so prudent an institution of his, in any age after him.

3dly, We read of the elders and judges of Israel, not only after the death of Moses, but after the Israelites were settled in the land of Canaan (a). Now by these the rabbies understand the seventy elders, or Sanhedrim; and to the same purpose they interpret a passage of the Psalmist concerning the "thrones of judgment, that are set, or do sit, in Jerusalem (b)." The like reference to the Sanhedrim they find in the title of the forty-fifth Psalm; where the Targum interprets thothannim, those that sit in the Sanhedrim of Moses. And thus Dr. Lightfoot understands the expression concerning the scribes and pharisees, who are said to sit in Moses's seat (c); that is, in the Sanhedrim, which was instituted by Moses.

4thly, In order to prove, not only that the Sanhedrim subsisted in the days of Zedekiah, but likewise that its power and authority were superior to the king's; they alledge the following passage of the prophet Jeremy, "Therefore the princes said unto the king, we beseech thee, let this man be put to death; for, &c. Then Zedekiah the king said, behold he is in your hand; for the king is not he that can do any thing against you (d)." By the princes here spoke

(a) Josh. xxiv. 1. Judg. ii. 7. (b) Psal. cxxii. 5.
(c) Matt. xxiii. 2. (d) Jer. xxxviii. 4, 5.

spoke of, they understand the elders, or members of the Sanhedrim.

These are the chief arguments, which are produced to prove, that the Sanhedrim, so famous in the latter ages of the jewish polity, was instituted by Moses, and always subsisted after his time.

On the other side, several arguments are brought to show, that the court of the Sanhedrim was of no higher antiquity than the time of the Maccabees, and was then first set up. The first is,

1st. That we do not find, in scripture, one word of any such high court, either in the times of the judges, or of the kings; and it is as preposterous to suppose a jewish historian should not mention the Sanhedrim, if such a court there were in those times; as that a latin historian should write a history of the roman affairs, without ever mentioning the senate.

2dly. We find, in perusing their history, that the people generally followed the king, whether in the practice of idolatry, or in the worship of Jehovah; which it is hard to account for, if such a court had then subsisted, with an authority superior to that of the king.

3dly. It plainly appears, that both the judges and the kings exercised a despotic power, and did all things according to their own will, without consulting the Sanhedrim; as doubtless they would, and must, have done, if such a court of superior authority had then existed: "And he said, This will be the manner of the king, that shall reign over you, he will take your sons, and appoint them for himself, &c. (*a*)."

4thly,

(*a*) 1 Sam. viii. 11. See also 2 Sam. x. 2. and 1 Kings iii. 16,—ult.

4thly, It is ſaid in the book of Judges, that "in thoſe days there was no king in Iſrael; therefore every man did that which was right in his own eyes (*a*)." But if there had been ſuch a national court, as is pretended, of ſuperior authority to a king, or a judge, there being "no king" could not have been aſſigned as the reaſon of the people's living without any government.

5thly, The ſtory of the Levite, who was ſo vilely abuſed at Gibeah, ſending an account of his wrongs to the twelve tribes (*b*), evidently ſhows, there was then no ſuch national court, as the Sanhedrim; for if there had been ſo, to that he would naturally have applied.

Upon the whole then, it appears moſt probable, that the inſtitution of the ſeventy elders was only temporary, to aſſiſt Moſes during the abode of the Iſraelites in the wilderneſs; and perhaps alſo to aſſiſt Joſhua, till they were ſettled in Canaan; but that afterward they aſſembled no more, and that the Sanhedrim, ſo famous in later ages, was ſet up in the time of the Maccabees.

As for the judges, which we read of after the death of Joſhua, they ſeem to be raiſed up, and appointed, only on particular occaſions; but were not præfecti ordinarii, like Moſes and Joſhua; nor were they continued in their office during life, but only as long as there was occaſion; for inſtance, to deliver Iſrael from the power of ſome oppreſſor. Only it is ſaid, that "Samuel judged Iſrael all the days of his life;" which ſeems to be mentioned as a particular caſe

(*a*) Judg. xvii. 6. xxi. 25. (*b*) Judg. xix. 29, 30.

case (a). As for the other judges, Godwin compares them to the roman dictators; who were appointed only on extraordinary emergencies; as in case of war abroad, or conspiracies at home; and whose power, while they continued in office, was great, and even absolute. Thus the hebrew judges seem to have been appointed, only, in cases of national trouble and danger. Othniel, the first judge, was raised up to deliver Israel from the oppression of Chusan-rishathaim (b); Ehud, the second, to deliver them from the power of Moab, who had oppressed them eighteen years (c); and Gideon, on occasion of their oppression by the Midianites (d).

The power of the judges, while in their office, was very great; as appears from Gideon's punishing the elders of Succoth (e). Though their power does not seem to have been limited to a certain time, as that of the roman dictators, which continued for half a year; yet it is reasonable to suppose, that when they had performed the business, for which they were appointed, they retired to a private life. This Godwin infers from Gideon's refusing to take upon him the perpetual government of Israel, as being inconsistent with the Theocracy (f).

That the judges were not properly successors to Joshua in his office, as not being præfecti ordinarii, is argued

1st, From there being no mention of the appointment of a successor to Joshua, as there was to Moses; nor any one actually made judge, till some years after his death; when Othniel was

(a) 1 Sam. vii. 15. (b) Judg. iii. 8,—10. (c) Judg. iii. 14, 15. (d) Judg. vi. 33, 34. (e) Judg. viii. 16. (f) Judg. viii. 23.

was raised to that office on a particular occasion.

2dly, From its being represented as so criminal a thing for the people to desire a king, and even to amount to a "rejecting God, that he should not reign over them (a)." Now the difference betwixt judges and kings, was but very little. They seem to have had the same authority and power; only the judges were never crowned, nor attended with such pomp, nor invested with such regalia, as kings were: if therefore the judges had been perpetual dictators, succeeding one another regularly and without intermission, why should the people desire a king? Or where was the great evil of it when they did? Was it the sole purport of their request, that their judges might have the title of kings? They had this before; for when there was no judge, it is said, "there was no king in Israel." Or was it only, that their judges might be crowned, and have the regalia? This was a matter of very little moment, and hardly worth disputing about. Their desire, then, plainly was, that they might have a judge, or king, in perpetuum, as the stated supream officer in the government, like other nations; and not merely on extraordinary occasions. Now this was altering the constitution and form of government, which God had established; and on this account their motion was so displeasing to Samuel, and to God himself.

However, on the other hand, in order to prove the judges were perpetual dictators, and in their office quite different from kings, it is objected and argued,

1st,

(a) 1 Sam. viii. 5,—7.

1st, That Samuel had made his ſons judges (*a*); and it was nothing but the ill government of theſe new judges, that made the people deſire a king (*b*). Therefore the kingly office was different from that of the judges; conſequently the judges might have been perpetual dictators, notwithſtanding the people now deſired a king.

But to this it may be anſwered, that the title judge was uſually applied, not only to the one ſupream officer under God, ſuch as Othniel, Barak, &c. but alſo to inferior magiſtrates (*c*). Now it is not ſaid, that Samuel made one of his ſons the judge κατ' ἐξοχην, that is by appointing him to be his ſucceſſor, or his partner in the government; but that he made them both judges; and they were judges in Beer-ſheba, that is, inferior magiſtrates, whoſe office it was to diſpenſe and execute the laws of Jehovah.

2dly, It is alledged, that the judge κατ' ἐξοχην is ſpoken of as a ſtated officer in the hebrew commonwealth: "Thou ſhalt come unto the prieſts, the levites, and unto the judge that ſhall be in thoſe days (*d*)." Conſequently there muſt always be a judge.

But thoſe on the other ſide of the queſtion reply, that והשפט hvl hashophet, may as well be rendered, "OR unto the judge;" meaning, in caſe there ſhould be any judge at that time. And this ſenſe they apprehend is confirmed by its being ſaid, "The man that will not hearken to the prieſt, or to the judge, even that man ſhall die (*e*).

3dly,

(*a*) 1 Sam. viii. 1. (*b*) ver. 3,—5. (*c*) Joſh. viii. 33. xxiii. 2. and elſewhere. (*d*) Deut. xvii. 9. (*e*) ver. 12.

3dly, The chasm or interreghum betwixt Samson and Samuel, when there was no judge, is mentioned once and again, as an extraordinary thing, and a calamitous circumstance to the nation (a). Therefore, ordinarily, there was one supream judge over all the other officers and ministers of state.

But it is replied, this will not prove, that they had perpetual judges; but only that it was a calamity to be without a judge at a time, when such an officer was so much wanted.

It is made a question, what time that was which is here referred to, when "there was no king, or judge, in Israel." The order of the history leads us to conceive, it was betwixt Samson and Samuel. But Dr. Patrick is of opinion, that those five last chapters of the book of Judges are a distinct history, in which the author gives an account of several memorable transactions, which fell out in or about the time of the judges; whose story he would not interrupt by intermixing these matters with it; and therefore reserved them to be related by themselves, in the second part, or appendix. Wherein he first gives an account how idolatry crept into the tribe of Ephraim, then how it was propagated among the Danites; after which he relates a most heinous act of adultery, committed in the tribe of Benjamin; which introduces the history, first, of the almost total destruction of that tribe for their countenancing that detestable fact, and then, of its restoration. Now on such extraordinary occasions, they should have appointed a judge, especially when the inferior officers so shamefully neglected their duty.

These

(a) Judg. xvii 6. xviii. 1. xix. 1. xxi. 25.

These hebrew judges were in all fifteen, from Othniel the first to Samuel the last. Before whose death the form of government was changed, and Saul was made king.

We may remark, that the carthaginian Suffites, the chief officers and magistrates in that state, whom both the greek and latin historians frequently mention *, seem evidently to have derived their title from the hebrew word שפטים shophetim: which affords one argument, among several others, of the Carthaginians being originally Canaanites, driven out of their country by Joshua; since by this it appears, that their ancient language was Hebrew, the language of the Canaanites †.

Procopius Gazæus observes, that the history of the judges is of excellent use to represent to us the mighty power of true religion to make a nation happy, and the dismal calamities which impiety brings upon it. And therefore, the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews has thought fit to propound several examples of the power of faith out of this book; as of Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephthah and Samuel; who, being animated by this principle, did great things for their nation, and obtained signal victories over their enemies ‡.

There is no affair related in this book, which has been made so much a matter of controversy, as that of Jephthah's vow; which, therefore, we shall now take into consideration.

Con-

* Livii hist. lib. 28. cap. 37. lib. 30. cap. 7.

† Vid. Bochart. geograp. sacr. part. 2. lib. 1. cap. 24. apud opera, tom. 1. p. 473. edit. Lugd. Bat. 1712.

‡ Patrick on Judges, at the beginning.

Concerning Jephthah's vow.

It has been earneſtly diſputed, both among Jews and Chriſtians, whether Jephthah did ſacrifice his daughter. And very conſiderable men have appeared on each ſide of this queſtion. Not but if Jephthah had been a Heathen, I ſuppoſe, we ſhould have had no more difficulty, in underſtanding the account given of this matter in the book of Judges (*a*), of his ſacrificing his daughter; than we have, in underſtanding Homer's account of Agamemnon's ſacrificing his daughter Iphigenia, or Idomeneus his ſon, of a real ſacrifice. I do not know, that it is ſo much as pretended, that the hebrew text will not admit of ſuch a ſenſe, or even that it is not the moſt natural one, which the words will bear. But that a judge of the hebrew nation, who were worſhippers of the true God, and whoſe law did not admit of human ſacrifices, ſhould be guilty of this groſſeſt act of heathen ſuperſtition, is what ſeveral of the jewiſh rabbies can by no means admit; and many learned Chriſtians, not knowing how to reconcile ſuch a barbarous, as well as ſuperſtitious, murder with the good character which is given of Jephthah in the epiſtle to the Hebrews (*b*), (where his name ſtands in the catalogue of thoſe ancient worthies who were illuſtrious inſtances of the power of faith;) have endeavoured to ſoften the account of this inhuman ſacrifice, and to introduce a milder ſenſe. For this purpoſe the art of criticiſm hath been diligently applied to the hebrew text, in order to make it ſignify no more, than that Jephthah devoted his daughter to

(*a*) chap. xi. (*b*) chap. xi. 32.

to perpetual virginity, for the honour, and in the ſervice, of God. Among the Jews, rabbi Joſeph and rabbi David Kimchi, and rabbi Levi Ben Gerſon *, have eſpouſed this ſide of the queſtion; as among the chriſtian writers, have Eſtius, Vatablus, Junius, Grotius, Druſius, Heinſius, Glaſſius and Le Clerc.

In favour of the milder ſenſe, that Jephthah devoted his daughter to perpetual virginity, it is alledged,

1ſt, That ſhe deſired time, before the vow was performed upon her, to bewail her virginity, not the loſs of her life (*a*). From whence it is concluded, that it was not death, but perpetual virginity that ſhe was devoted to ſuffer; and the reaſon, they ſay, why Jephthah was ſo troubled when his daughter met him (*b*), was, becauſe ſhe being his only child (*c*), and he now obliged by his vow to devote her to perpetual virginity, his family would ſoon be extinct in Iſrael.

But to this it is replied, that to die childleſs was accounted by the Jews a very ſad calamity. Hence it was denounced as a heavy curſe on Coniah, the ſon of Jehoiakim, king of Judah: "Thus ſaith the Lord, write this man childleſs (*d*)." And therefore Jephthah's daughter bewailed her virginity, or her dying childleſs, more than the loſs of her life.

2dly, It is alledged in favour of the notion of her being devoted to perpetual virginity, that the words לתנות לבת יפתח lethannoth lebath Jephthah (*e*), which we render, "to lament the daughter of Jephthah;" ſhould be rendered,

* Selden. de jure nat. & gent. lib. iv. cap. xi.

(*a*) Judg. xi. 37. (*b*) ver. 35. (*c*) ver. 34.
(*d*) Jer. xxii. 30. (*e*) Judg. xi. 40.

as in the margin, "to talk with the daughter of Jephthah;" that is, to visit and comfort her in her recluse life. To support this sense of the word לתנות lethannoth, they allledge the following expression in this book of Judges, "There shall they rehearse the righteous acts of the Lord (a)." Where they observe, the verb תנה thana, is rightly rendered, and can only mean, to rehearse.

But to this argument it is replied, that, allowing this sense of the verb, it will not at all contradict the notion of her being sacrificed; for then the meaning of this passage will be, that "the daughters of Israel went yearly, to rehearse the tragical story of the daughter of Jephthah." Or even if we render the word תנה thana, as in the margin, to talk; yet לתנות לבת lethannoth lebath, would rather signify "to talk concerning," than to "talk with;" as אמרי־לי imri-li, is to "say of me," or "concerning me;" not "with me (b);" and יצוה־לך jetzavveh-lak, signifies, "he shall give charge concerning thee," not "with thee (c)." And thus לתנות לבת־יפתח lethannoth lebath Jephthah, signifies to talk concerning the daughter of Jephthah, and not with her. So that this critique is not at all inconsistent with the notion of her being sacrificed, but rather confirms it.

3dly, The chief critical argument in favour of her being devoted to perpetual virginity, is taken from this clause in Jephthah's vow (d), והיה ליהוה והעליתיהו עולה vehaja laihova vehangnalithihu gnolath: where, they say, the Vau should be understood not copulatively, but disjunctively; and

(a) Judg. v. 11. (b) Gen. xx. 13. (c) Pſal. xci. 11.
(d) Judg. xi. 31.

and then the meaning is, "Whatsoever cometh to meet me, shall either be the Lord's, or I will offer it up for a burnt-offering," that is, in case it should be a creature fit for sacrifice. Thus Glassius, in his Philologia sacra, understands it, and so Drusius, and several others; and they produce some other texts, where the Vau is used disjunctively; as where it is said, "He that curseth his father, or his mother, shall surely be put to death (*a*)." Again, "Asahel turned not to the right hand, or to the left (*b*); where the Vau cannot signify and. In like manner the conjunctive, que, in Latin is sometimes used in a disjunctive sense. Thus Virgil——

Aut Pelago Danaum insidias, suspectaque dona
Præcipitare jubent, subjectisque urere flammis,
Æneid. 2. l. 37.

Again,

Saxum ingens volvunt alii, radiisque rotarum
Districti pendent. ——— Æneid. 6. l. 616.

Now taking the Vau in this sense in the passage before us, the meaning will be, "I will devote it to God, or it shall be offered for a burnt-offering."

But to this it is replied, that every thing sacrificed, was offered or devoted to God; but every thing devoted to God, was not sacrificed. Therefore it would be as improper to say, I will either devote it to God, or offer it in sacrifice, as it would be to say, animal aut homo; or, homo aut Petrus; or I will ride either

(*a*) Exod. xxi. 17. compared with Matt. xv. 4.
(*b*) 2 Sam. ii. 19.

then on a four-footed beaſt or a horſe; becauſe a horſe is a four-footed beaſt.

Beſides, in other parallel texts, where vows are expreſſed, like this of Jephthah's; and where the Vau is uſed in the ſame manner as it is here; no body will ſuppoſe it ſhould be taken disjunctively. As in Hannah's vow (*a*), "I will give him unto the Lord all the days of his life, and there ſhall no razor come upon his head;" no body underſtands it thus, "I will either give him to the Lord, or no razor ſhall come upon his head." So in Jacob's vow, "Then ſhall the Lord be my God; AND this ſtone, which I have ſet up for a pillar, ſhall be God's houſe (*b*)."

You ſee then, that the words of the hebrew text will hardly bear any other ſenſe than is agreeable to the more common opinion, that Jephthah did devote his daughter to death, and actually ſacrifice her.

However let us attend to the reaſons, which ſome have offered, why the text ſhould be interpreted in the milder ſenſe, even though it ſhould oblige us to depart from the more natural meaning and conſtruction of the words.

1ſt, Some of the jewiſh rabbies ſeem to think it neceſſary for the honour of their nation, to vindicate Jephthah's character, at any rate, from the blemiſh of murder; which, if committed, muſt have been a double or triple crime; as a murder; as a moſt unnatural murder of his own daughter and only child; and alſo as a heatheniſh rite of ſacrificing, which the Lord God did by no means permit. But, ſurely, it is hardly worth their while to labour

ſo

(*a*) 1 Sam. i. 11. (*b*) Gen. xxviii. 21, 22.

ſo earneſtly, as ſome of them have done, to vindicate Jephthah's character, for the ſake of their national honour; while the lives and actions of ſo many of their wicked kings are on record in the ſacred hiſtory; particularly of Ahaz, who "made his ſon to paſs through the fire according to the abominations of the Heathen (*a*);" of Manaſſeh, who "cauſed his children to paſs through the fire in the valley of the ſon of Hinnom (*b*): which, if it did not mean their burning them to death, in ſacrifice to their idols, was at leaſt a rite of luſtration (as the Heathens called it), by which parents dedicated their children to the worſhip and ſervice of their falſe gods.

2dly, It is pleaded, that Jephthah is not cenſured in any part of ſacred hiſtory for what he did on this occaſion; which, they ſuppoſe, if he had been guilty of ſo abominable a crime as ſacrificing his own daughter, he would have been.

To this it may be replied, that if every action, mentioned in the ſacred hiſtory without cenſure, muſt therefore be concluded to be lawful and good, many actions, which we are ſure were contrary to the poſitive law of God, and others which were immoral in their own nature, muſt be held lawful. As Samſon's marrying a Philiſtine, contrary to the law, which forbad the Jews to marry out of their own nation; his lewdneſs with Dalilah; and his revengeful ſpirit, which he manifeſted to the laſt, and carried to ſuch an extreme as to ſacrifice his own life, that he might "be avenged on the Philiſtines

(*a*) 2 Kings xvi. 3. (*b*) 2 Chron. xxxiii. 6.

liſtines for his two eyes." Another argument againſt the more literal ſenſe of this hiſtory is,

3dly, It cannot be thought, that God would have given victory and ſucceſs to Jephthah in his expedition againſt the Ammonites, upon his making ſo wicked a vow as this, of offering a human ſacrifice.

But it is to be conſidered, that the private intereſt of Jephthah was not ſo much concerned in this expedition, as the publick intereſt of the whole Jewiſh nation; and why might not God ſucceed him in his war againſt the Ammonites, notwithſtanding his faults, for the ſake of delivering his favourite people whom he had taken under his ſpecial protection; as in many other caſes he hath given ſucceſs to wicked inſtruments, for accompliſhing the wiſe and holy deſigns of his providence and grace? But

4thly, The chief reaſon, which has induced many Chriſtians to ſoften the ſtory of Jephthah's unnatural murder and ſacrifice, is his being mentioned in the catalogue of believers, in the epiſtle to the Hebrews (*a*). From whence it is concluded, that he was not meerly a good man, but a man of eminent piety; as all, whoſe names are in that catalogue, are ſuppoſed to be. And taking this for granted, they argue, How can it be thought, that a good man, nay an eminently good man, ſhould deliberately commit ſo horrid a crime, which was doubly contrary to the divine law, as to murder and ſacrifice his own daughter?

To this it is replied,

1ſt, That there are great infirmities and faults of good men recorded in ſcripture, which perhaps,

(*a*) chap. xi. 32.

haps, considering all circumstances, were as heinous as this action of Jephthah's. As David's debauching the wife of Uriah, and then perfidiously procuring the death of her husband; and Solomon's idolatry, of whom, though it is not expressly said, that he offered any human sacrifices, yet we read that he went "after Milcom, the abomination of the Ammonites (*a*);" which is another name for Molech, as the same idol is called: He "built an high place for Chemosh, the abomination of Moab, and Molech, the abomination of the children of Ammon (*b*)." Now it being well known, that human sacrifices were commonly offered by the Heathens to the idol Molech, it is not an improbable inference from the passages just cited, that Solomon offered them. However that be, if Solomon, the son of David, who lived in times of great light, and had enjoyed the advantage of a religious education far beyond what Jephthah had done; if he practised the idolatrous worship of the Moabites and Ammonites, is it any wonder Jephthah should be led by a blind superstition to sacrifice his daughter? It is certain Jephthah had had, comparatively, but mean advantages for the knowledge of religion and the law of God. In his younger days he dwelt at Gilead, on the other side Jordan; very remote from Shiloh, where the tabernacle was, where the publick ordinances of divine worship were celebrated, and which, therefore, in those times was the fountain of knowledge and religion among the Jews. After his father's death, his brethren drove him out of the family; upon which he

(*a*) 1 Kings xi. 5. (*b*) ver. 7.

went and dwelt in the land of Tob, a country no where elſe mentioned in ſcripture; but it was, undoubtedly, out of Canaan, and therefore a heathen country. And now, when he returned into the land of Iſrael, the true religion was even there at a very low ebb, according to the account we have of the ſtate of it amongſt the Iſraelites in thoſe days: "The children of Iſrael did evil in the ſight of the Lord, and ſerved Baalim, and Aſhtaroth, and the gods of Syria, and the gods of Zidon, and the gods of Moab, and the gods of the children of Ammon, and the gods of the Philiſtines, and forſook the Lord, and ſerved him not (*a*)." And though we read, indeed, (*b*), that they had put away the ſtrange gods, before Jephthah's return; yet the knowledge of the law of God could not be revived on a ſudden. Probably therefore, as Jephthah had lived among the Heathen, with whom human ſacrifices were commonly practiſed, and had little opportunity of acquaintance with the law of Jehovah, he might, at that time, think, the higheſt honour he could pay to the God of Iſrael, was to offer him a human ſacrifice? Now, all this conſidered, will not his unavoidable ignorance plead ſtrongly in his excuſe? And may we not ſuppoſe he was a man of a pious turn, and had a zeal for God, though not according to knowledge, when he made, and performed, this vow?

2dly, Shall I venture to ſuggeſt a query, whether Jephthah's name being inſerted in the catalogue of believers, or of thoſe who are remarkable inſtances of the power of faith, is ſufficient

(*a*) Judg. x. 6. (*b*) ver. 16.

ſufficient to prove that he was a good man? The deſign of this chapter is plainly, to ſhow the power of faith in ſeveral different views of it, and as acted on ſeveral different objects. Therefore, though all the perſons whoſe names are here mentioned, were, no doubt, remarkable inſtances of the power of faith, of one kind, or another; yet it is not perhaps ſo certain, that they all had juſtifying and ſaving faith.

The firſt perſon, mentioned in this catalogue, is Abel; whoſe faith, as it rendered his ſacrifice more acceptable to God, than that of his brother Cain, muſt be ſuppoſed to reſpect the promiſed antitype of the ancient expiatory ſacrifices, or the atonement of Chriſt. Soon after, Noah's faith is celebrated, for his believing God's threatning of the univerſal deluge; and then the faith of Abraham, and the patriarchs, by which they "looked for a city which hath foundations whoſe builder and maker is God;" and which therefore made them eaſy and contented with their ſojourning and unſettled condition in this world. All theſe are ſaid to "dye in faith (*a*)." After ſeveral other names, and inſtances of the power of faith, as acted upon particular promiſes, the apoſtle mentions ſome of the jewiſh heroic generals, whoſe faith in God's promiſe, of protecting and ſupporting their nation, inſpired them with extraordinary courage in fighting for the Iſraelites againſt their enemies and oppreſſors; ſo that "by faith they ſubdued kingdoms." Yet, if a man might have the faith of miracles, ſo as to remove mountains, and not be a good man, as the

(*a*) Heb. xi. 13.

the apostle elsewhere supposes (a); might he not have this particular faith in God's promise of supporting the Israelitish nation, for which Rahab, and Gideon, and Barak, and Samson, and Jephthah are here celebrated, and at the same time not be a good man?

It will be replied perhaps,

1st, That after the catalogue of those names it is added (b), "of whom the world was not worthy."

I answer, That seems to be said, not of the victorious generals, who are mentioned along with Jephthah, but of another class of believers, who are mentioned after them; namely, the confessors and martyrs, who had been so unworthily treated by the world.

2dly, Is it not intimated in the two last verses of this eleventh chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews, that all those whose names were before recited, are now made perfect? "These all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promises, God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect."

We answer, The verb τελειοω, and the adjective τελειος, are applied by the Greek writers to maturity of age; and thus in the New Testament (c), τελειων δε εστιν η στερεα τροφη: "Strong meat is for them that are of full age." Again, "In malice be ye children, but in understanding be ye men," τελειοι γινεσθε (d). And ανηρ τελειος (e) signifies a perfect or full grown man *. Now

(a) 1 Cor. xiii. 2. (b) Heb. xi. 38. (c) Heb. v. 14. (d) 1 Cor. xiv. 20. (e) Eph. iv. 13.

* See Xenoph. Cyropæd. lib. 1. p. 6. edit. Hutch. 1738. where τελειοις ανδρασιν may be translated, viris adeptis plenam ætatem, full grown men.

Now the apoſtle repreſents the church under the former diſpenſation, when thoſe perſons lived of whom he had been ſpeaking before, as in a ſtate of minority; but under the goſpel diſpenſation, as advanced to a ſtate of maturity. The meaning therefore ſeems to be, that though God had vouchſafed ſome extraordinary meaſures of faith to particular perſons, under the former diſpenſation; yet he did not then raiſe his church to that ſtate of maturity to which he had now advanced it.

I ſhall cloſe this diſſertation with ſome arguments in confirmation of the more commonly received opinion, that Jephthah did ſacrifice his daughter, and that he intended a human ſacrifice when he made this vow.

Of this ſentiment is Joſephus, the chaldee paraphraſt, and ſeveral famous rabbies. Some of them, indeed, founded their opinion on a miſtaken ſenſe of this paſſage in Leviticus, "None devoted, which ſhall be devoted of men, ſhall be redeemed; but ſhall ſurely be put to death, מות יומת moth jumath (*a*). From whence they concluded, that, in ſome caſes, human ſacrifices might be offered in conformity to the law of God. Whereas that text, either means, according to Dr. Sykes, that every perſon, who is devoted to the ſpecial ſervice of God, as Samuel was by his mother, ſhall not be redeemed, but ſhall die in that devoted ſtate: And he gives ſeveral inſtances, where מות יומת moth jumath, is thus applied to a natural death; as when God ſaid unto Adam, "In the day that thou eateſt thereof, thou ſhalt ſurely die (*b*);

and

(*a*) chap. xxvii. 29. (*b*) Gen. ii. 17.

and when the Lord ſaid of the murmuring Iſraelites, "They ſhall ſurely die in the wilderneſs (a);" though they were not ſacrificed or executed, but died a natural death *: Or elſe, the text in Leviticus, according to Mr. Selden, is to be reſtrained to ſuch as were devoted to death by the appointment and law of God; as the inhabitants of Jericho (b); and ſuch of the Iſraelites, as in caſe of war did not obey military orders, and perform the charge laid upon them; in particular, the inhabitants of Jabeſh Gilead, who complied not with the general ſummons to go and fight againſt Benjamin (c). And perhaps it may extend to all who had been guilty of any crime, that was made capital by the law of God; and ſo the deſign of it was no more, then to reſtrain inferior magiſtrates from pardoning capital offenders, which was the prerogative of God only, as their king †.

Moſt of the ancient chriſtian writers are of opinion, that Jephthah actually ſacrificed his daughter; and ſo is Dr. Lightfoot ‡.

Now the chief reaſons, which are alledged in favour of this opinion, beſides that it agrees to the more natural meaning of the hebrew text, are

1ſt, That there is no rule, nor precedent in ſcripture, to juſtify the practice of devoting perſons to perpetual virginity; but on the contrary, this is ſpoken of as one of the antichriſtian corruptions of the "latter times, when men

(a) Numb. xxvi. 65.

* See Sykes's Principles and Connection of natural and revealed Religion, chap. 13.

(b) Joſh. vi. 17. (c) Judg. xxi. 5, 8, 9, 10.

† Selden de Jure Nat. & Gent. lib iv. cap. 6,—10

‡ Serm. on Judg. xi. 39. vol. 2. p. 1215.

men ſhould depart from the faith, and give heed to ſeducing ſpirits, and doctrines of devils (*a*)." Nor was there any office belonging to the temple ſervice to be performed by women; except, perhaps, that ſome of the daughters of the Levites aſſiſted by their voices in the temple choir; as ſome think, is intimated in this paſſage of the firſt book of Chronicles, "And God gave to Heman fourteen ſons and three daughters. All theſe were under the hands of their father, for ſong in the houſe of the Lord with cymbals, pſalteries and harps, for the ſervice of the houſe of God, according to the king's order to Aſaph, Jeduthun and Heman (*b*)." However Jephthah was not a Levite, and therefore his daughter could bear no part even in that ſervice; nor hath Nunnery any countenance, either in the jewiſh, or chriſtian law; and to ſuppoſe, therefore, that Jephthah devoted his daughter to perpetual virginity, is to ſuppoſe him acting as contrary to the law of God, as if he had ſacrified her.

3dly, What could he expect to come out of the door of his houſe to meet him, but a human perſon? Can we think that Jephthah had his dog in his thoughts, when he made this vow? a creature, that was particularly excepted from being in any ſenſe ſanctified and devoted to God; as any clean beaſt might be (*c*).

3dly, If he had intended no more than the ſacrifice of a bullock, or a ram, what need was there of ſuch a ſolemn vow? If he had meant a brutal ſacrifice, he would ſurely have vowed to ſacrifice Hecatombs, rather then a ſingle animal, on ſo great an occaſion; or like Jacob,

(*a*) 1 Tim. iv. 1. (*b*) 1 Chron. xxv. 5, 6.
(*c*) Lev. xxvii. 9, 11. compared with Deut. xxiii. 18.

he would have vowed to give the "tenth of all his ſubſtance unto the Lord (*a*)."

4thly, We read, that it was a "cuſtom in Iſrael, that the daughters of Iſrael went yearly to lamens the daughter of Jehthah (*b*)." Now the hebrew word חק chok, which we render cuſtom, ſignifies a ſtatute or ordinance of laſting obligation. Thus it is peculiarly applied to the law, which God gave by Moſes, in the following paſſage, "Behold I have taught you ſtatutes (חקים chukkim) and judgments, even as the Lord my God commanded me, that ye ſhould do ſo in the land whither ye go to poſſeſs it. Keep therefore, and do them, for this is your wiſdom and your underſtanding in the ſight of the nations, which ſhall hear all theſe ſtatutes," כל־החקים col-hachukkim. (*c*) And ſo in many other places. This cuſtom, therefore, of the daughters of Iſrael ſeems to be intended for an annual rite in perpetuum; and not that they went yearly to talk with her, as long as ſhe lived.

It is highly probable, that Homer grounded his fable of Agamemnon's ſacrificing his daughter Iphigenia, on ſome tradition of Jephthah's ſacrifice. And indeed the name Iphigenia ſeems to be a corruption of Jephthigenia, the daughter of Jephthah. Ovid, who has dreſſed up the ſtory in his way, makes Diana put a ſtag in her room; and ſeems, therefore, to have blended the tradition of Abraham's ſacrifice with that of Jephthah *. But to return to the conſideration of the hebrew government.—

(*a*) Gen. xxviii. 22. (*b*) Judg. xi. 39, 40. (*c*) Deut. iv. 6. * Vid. Capelli Diatrib. de voto Jephth. per totum; apud criticos ſacros in Jud. xi. and Mr. Hallet's note on Heb. xi. 32.

We have distinguished the time, in which God exercised a special authority over the people of Israel, into four periods, and are now upon the second of them; namely, from their entrance into Canaan to the captivity. We have gone through the government of the judges. We proceed now to the reign of the kings.

This continued, saith Godwin, from Saul to the captivity of Babylon about 530 years. But as, in the course of this work, we shall have a chapter by itself concerning the jewish kings, I shall only for the present observe, that they were of two sorts; those that reigned over the whole hebrew nation, who were only three, Saul, David, and Solomon; and those that reigned over some of the tribes only.

And these were

1st, The kings of the house of David, who were twenty in number, if you reckon Athaliah the queen, who usurped the throne for six years, after the death of her son Ahaziah (a). These kings reigned over the two tribes of Judah and Benjamin, until Nebuchadnezzar carried Zedekiah, the last of them, captive unto Babylon. They took their title from the larger tribe, and were called kings of Judah.

2dly, The kings of Israel, who reigned over the other ten tribes from the time of their rebellion against Rehoboam, the son of Solomon, to the Assyrian captivity. These kings were of several different families, and were in all nineteen from Jeroboam, the first, to Hosea, the last.

We

(a) 2 Kings xi.

We now proceed to the third period, which takes in the time of the captivity, and concludes with the end of it.

As the hebrew nation was divided into two distinct kingdoms, so each kingdom suffered a distinct captivity; the one is called the Assyrian, the other the Babylonish.

The Assyrian captivity was that of the ten tribes, which was begun in the reign of Pekah, king of Israel, when Tiglath-pileser, king of Assyria, conquered a part of his country, and carried away the people captive to Assyria (*a*). It was afterwards compleated by Salmanassar, who took Samaria, the capital of the kingdom of Israel, after three years siege, and went up through the land, and carried away the residue of the people captive into Assyria (*b*).

The people of the kingdom of Israel had greatly corrupted the worship of God, and had been very much given to idolatry, ever since their separation from the kingdom of Judah. It is said, that "they walked in the statutes of the Heathen, and served idols (*c*). And it is no wonder, therefore, that when they were removed into Assyria, multitudes of them fell in with the idolatrous worship and customs of that country, becoming mixed with the Assyrians, and in time losing the very name of Jews and Israelites; insomuch that the greater part of the ten tribes, as a peculiar people and visible church of God, were quite lost in that captivity.

The

(*a*) 2 Kings xv. 29. (*b*) 2 Kings xvii. 5, 6.
(*c*) ver. 8, 12.

The Babyloniſh captivity was that of the kingdom of Judah, or of the two tribes, who adhered to the houſe of David. It was begun by Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, in the reign of Jehoiakim, whom Nebuchadnezzar "bound in fetters, to carry him to Babylon. And he alſo carried away ſome of the veſſels belonging to the houſe of the Lord, to furniſh his own temple in Babylon (*a*)." From hence begun the period of the ſeventy years captivity. The people, buoyed up by their falſe prophets, were induced to believe, that theſe ſacred veſſels ſhould be ſhortly brought again from Babylon; but Jeremiah aſſured them of the contrary, and that all the remaining veſſels ſhould be carried after them (*b*). Accordingly about nine years afterwards, in the reign of Jehoiakim, Nebuchadnezzar made a ſecond deſcent againſt Judah, and "beſieged Jeruſalem, and took it, and carried away the king, and all the nobles, and the great men, and officers, and ten thouſand captives to Babylon, with all the treaſure of the houſe of the Lord, and the treaſure of the king's houſe; and cut in pieces all the veſſels of gold, which Solomon had made for the temple (*c*)." But the word וַיְקַצְּצֵם vaikatzetz, is not well rendered "cut in pieces", ſince it appears by a paſſage in Daniel, that theſe veſſels were preſerved entire; for "Belſhazzar, and his princes, his wives, and his concubines, drank wine in them (*d*)." The verb קָצַץ katzatz, ſignifies "to cut off;" as in the following paſſage of the ſecond book of Samuel, "David commanded his young men, and they ſlew them, that is, Rechab and Baanah the

(*a*) 2 Chron. xxxvi. 6, 7. (*b*) Jer. xxvii. 16, 17, 21, 22. (*c*) 2 Kings xxiv. 10,—16. (*d*) Dan. v. 2.

murderers of Iſhboſheth, and cut off, וַיְקַצְּצוּ vaikatzetzu, their hands and their feet, &c. (a)" Where it is uſed in the ſame form, as it is in the paſſage before us; in which, therefore, it can mean no more than the veſſels being cut off from their ſtands or baſes, and taken away from the temple.

Again, eleven years after this in the reign of Zedekiah, Nebuzar-adan, the babylonian general, came and ſacked and burnt Jeruſalem, and the temple, and carried away the remainder of the ſacred veſſels, together with all the Jews who remained in the country, (except ſome poor people, whom he left to till the land) captives into Babylon (b).

Four years after this, which was the twenty-third of the ſeventy, or from the beginning of the Babyloniſh captivity, Nebuzar-adan again invaded the land of Iſrael, and ſeized upon all the Jews he could meet with, and ſent them captive to Babylon (c). This was done probably in revenge for the murder of Gedaliah, whom Nebuchadnezzar had made governor of the Land; but whom Iſhmael killed (d). Upon the murder of Gedaliah, Johanan the ſon of Kareah, and many of the people, that were left, fled into Egypt for fear of the king of Babylon (e). So that all the Jews that Nebuzar-adan now found, and made captive, amounted to no more then ſeven hundred and fifty perſons. Thus was the captivity of Judah compleated, and the land was made deſolate, none of its former inhabitants being now left in it.

But

(a) 2 Sam. iv. 12. So alſo, 2 Kings xvi. 17. Ahaz "cut off" the borders of the baſes, &c. and chap. xviii. 16. Hezekiah "cut off" the gold from the doors, &c. Hallet's notes and diſcourſes, vol. 1. p. 1. (b) 2 Kings xxv. 8, &c. (c) Jer. lii. 30. (d) Jer. xli. 2. (e) ver. 16,—18. chap. xliii. 4,—7.

But though the captivity of Iſrael, and of Judah, had different beginnings, the former commencing an hundred years before the latter; yet they ended together, when Cyrus the king of Perſia, having conquered both the Chaldeans and Aſſyrians, and obtained univerſal monarchy, iſſued out a decree for reſtoring the Jews to their own land, and for rebuilding Jeruſalem and the temple (*a*). This is that famous Cyrus; who one hundred and forty years before the temple was deſtroyed, and two hundred years before he was born, was mentioned by name, in the prophecy of Iſaiah, as deſigned by God for reſtoring his people (*b*). It is not improbable, that prophecy might have been ſhewn to Cyrus by ſome captive Jews, perhaps by Daniel; which might be a means of moving him to accompliſh it. This appears to have been the opinion of the Jews in the time of Joſephus, which they had probably received by tradition. For he makes Cyrus ſay in his decree, "Becauſe the ſupreme God hath apparently made me king of the world, I believe him to be he, whom the people of Iſrael adore; for he predicted my name by his prophets, and that I ſhould build his temple at Jeruſalem in the land of Judea *

Upon this decree, the tribes of Judah and Benjamin aſſembled out of the ſeveral provinces of the kingdom of Babylon, and put themſelves under the conduct of Zerubbabel, the grandſon of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, who was made their governor; and of Joſhua the high-prieſt, to the number of forty-nine thouſand ſix hundred and ninety-ſeven perſons, and

(*a*) Ezra i. 1,—3. (*b*) Iſa. xliv. 28. xlv. 1,—4.
* Antiq. lib. xi. cap. 1. §. 1. edit. Haverc.

returned to their own land (*a*). And though the ten tribes, in their national capacity, were never reſtored; but the moſt part continue in their diſperſion to this day; inſomuch that the Aſſyrian captivity put a final period to the kingdom of Iſrael; yet as the decree of Cyrus extended to all the Jews, ſeveral perſons belonging to the ten tribes, now joined themſelves to Judah and Benjamin, and returned with them to their own land. We read, therefore, that among the ſacrifices offered at the feaſt of the dedication of the temple, on its being rebuilt, there were "twelve he-goats according to the number of the tribes of Iſrael (*b*)." Again, we read of "twelve bullocks" being ſacrificed "for all Iſrael (*c*)." From whence it is highly probable, that ſome of all the ten tribes were now returned; though ſtill it appears, that great numbers of the Jews, probably moſt part of the ten tribes, who ſtill adhered to the old religion, remained among the Heathen in the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus; whom Dr. Prideaux takes to be the Ahaſuerus mentioned in the book of Eſther, and for which opinion he offers ſubſtantial reaſons. This, therefore, muſt have been near eighty years after their firſt return, in the reign of Cyrus. It was at this time, that Ezra, a deſcendant from Seraiah the high-prieſt, and on account of his great learning called the ſcribe, obtained an ample commiſſion from Artaxerxes for his return to Jeruſalem; with all of his own nation who were willing to accompany him (*d*). Upon this many more of the Jews returned to their own land. Yet after all, few of the ten tribes, in com-

(*a*) See Ezra ii. (*b*) Ezra vi. 17. (*c*) Ezra viii. 35. (*d*) Ezra vii.

compariſon with thoſe of Judah and Benjamin, ever returned from their diſperſion. It appears, that at the time of Haman's conſpiracy, which muſt have been four or five years after the ſecond return under Ezra, there were ſtill a multitude of Jews diſperſed through the various provinces of the Perſian empire; beſides thoſe, who had mingled with idolaters, and embraced their religion. Dr. Prideaux thinks, it was by the favour of Eſther that Ezra obtained his commiſſion, and was made governor of the Jews in their own Land; which government he exerciſed for thirteen years. After him ſucceeded Nehemiah, who had a new commiſſion granted him by Artaxerxes, in the twentieth year of his reign, with full authority to repair the wall of Jeruſalem, and fortify it, in the ſame manner as before it was diſmantled by the Babylonians.

It may reaſonably be conjectured, that queen Eſther's intereſt with the king did not a little contribute to obtain this further favour for the Jews; and ſo much, indeed, ſeems to be hinted in the hiſtory of this tranſaction, where it is particularly remarked, that, when Artaxerxes gave this new commiſſion to Nehemiah, "the queen was ſitting by him (*a*)."

Nehemiah's commiſſion ſuperſeded that of Ezra, who therefore now reſigned his government, and employed himſelf in collecting and publiſhing a new and correct edition of the Scriptures, and in reſtoring the worſhip of God to its original purity *.

We proceed to the fourth period of the jewiſh hiſtory, which contains about ſix hundred

(*a*) Nehem. ii. 6.

* See Prideaux's connection, part. 1. book. 5.

years, from the end of their captivity to the deſtruction of Jeruſalem and of the jewiſh polity.

The Jews, who, after the return from the captivity, were ſettled again in their own land, were no longer divided into two kingdoms, as they were before; but were all one people, and under one government; which yet varied in its form through ſeveral ſucceeding ages.

1ſt, Upon their return from the captivity, Judea became a province of the Perſian empire, and was tributary to the Perſian monarch; as appears from the letter, which the enemies of the Jews wrote to Artaxerxes, in order to prevent the rebuilding of Jeruſalem; in which are theſe words, "Be it known now unto the king, that if this city be builded, and the walls ſet up again, then will they not pay toll, tribute, and cuſtom, and ſo thou ſhalt endamage the revenue of the kings (*a*)." Notwithſtanding which, though tributary, they enjoyed their own religion, and were governed by their own laws; and their governors, though they acted by virtue of a commiſſion from the court of Perſia, were, nevertheleſs, of their own nation; as Zerubbabel, Ezra, Nehemiah.

2dly, This ſtate of things, and this form of government, continued for upwards of two hundred years, until the time of Alexander the great; who having deſtroyed the Perſian empire, and eſtabliſhed the Grecian univerſal monarchy, the Jews became ſubject to him, and his ſucceſſors. Yet they were not properly conquered by him, as all the neighbouring nations were; God, having preſerved them by a ſpecial

(*a*) Ezra iv. 13.

cial and very extraordinary providence, which is thus related by Joſephus *.

When Alexander was engaged in the ſiege of Tyre, he ſent to Jaddua, the jewiſh high-prieſt, for auxiliary troops, and neceſſaries for his army. Jaddua excuſed himſelf, alledging his oath to Darius. Alexander, being greatly increaſed, reſolved to take a ſevere revenge. As ſoon, therefore, as he had made himſelf maſter of Tyre, and of Gaza, he marched againſt Jeruſalem. Jaddua, in his pontifical robes, accompanied by the other prieſts in their proper habits, went out, by divine direction, in ſolemn proceſſion to meet Alexander. As ſoon as the king ſaw him, he haſtened towards him, and bowed down to him with a religious veneration of that ſacred name, which was inſcribed on the golden fillet round his tiara. While all ſtood amazed at this extraordinary behaviour, Parmenio alone ventured to enquire of him, why he, who was adored by all, ſhould himſelf pay ſuch devotion to the jewiſh high-prieſt. He replied, he did not pay it to the high-prieſt, but to the God whoſe prieſt he was; for that when he was at Dio in Macedonia, and was deliberating how he ſhould carry on the war againſt the Perſians, this very perſon, in the very habit he now wore, appeared to him in a dream, and encouraged him to paſs over into Aſia; aſſuring him, that God would give him the Perſian empire. Having ſaid this, Alexander gave his hand to Jaddua, and entered Jeruſalem with him in a very friendly manner, and, under his direction, offered ſacrifices to God in the temple. Here Jaddua ſhewed him

* Antiq. lib. xi. cap. 8. §. 3,—5. edit. Haverc.

the prophecy of Daniel, which predicted the overthrow of the Persian empire by a Grecian king. At which he was so pleased, that he ordered the Jews to request whatever was agreeable to them. Upon this Jaddua petitioned, that they might enjoy their own laws and religion, and be excused from paying tribute every seventh year, because in that year they neither sowed nor reaped. All which he freely granted.

After the death of Alexander the Jews became subject and tributary to the kings of Egypt, or Syria; as, by various turns of providence, one or the other extended their dominion and power into those parts. The former were called Lagii or Lagides, from Lagus the father of Ptolemy the first; the latter, Seleucii or Seleucides, from Seleucus Nicanor king of Syria.

The Jews, at length, were miserably persecuted and distressed by Antiochus Epiphanes, the eighth of the Seleucian kings, about one hundred and seventy years before Christ. He is generally supposed to be that "vile person," of whom Daniel prophesied under that appellation (*a*); and he actually proved altogether as profane and cruel as the prophet represents him; for he laid siege to Jerusalem, and took it by storm, and in two days time massacred forty thousand of its inhabitants, and sold as many more to the neighbouring nations for slaves. He impiously forced himself into the temple, and into the holy of holies; he sacrificed a great sow upon the altar of burnt-offerings, and caused broth to be made of some part of the flesh, and to be sprinkled all over the temple.

(*a*) chap. xi. 21. & seq.

temple. He afterwards plundered the ſacred edifice of all its golden and ſilver veſſels and utenſils, to the value of eighteen hundred talents of gold; and having made the like plunder in the city, he left it, after he had, to the further vexation of the Jews, appointed Philip, a Phrygian, to be their governor; who was a man of a cruel and barbarous temper. Upon this

3dly, Their ſtate and form of government was changed by the Maccabees.

When Antiochus had iſſued out a decree, that all nations, under his dominion, ſhould conform to his religion, and worſhip the ſame gods and in the ſame manner, that he did; which decree was levelled chiefly againſt the Jews; he ſent commiſſioners to execute it in Judea. One of them named Apelles, came to Modin, where dwelt Mattathias, a very honourable prieſt, and zealous for the law of his God; he was the great grandſon of Aſmonæus; from whence it is probable the family had the name of Aſmoneans; though others derive that title from the hebrew word חשמנים chaſhmannim, which ſignifies magnates or proceres. This Mattathias, with his five ſons, fell upon the king's commiſſioner, as he was endeavouring to perſwade the people to ſacrifice to idols, and ſlew him and all his attendants. After which he retired into the mountains; whither many of the Jews following him, they formed an army, and ſtood upon their defence. Afterwards, leaving their faſtneſſes, they went about the country, deſtroying the heathen altars, and idolaters, and reſtoring the worſhip of God according to the law, wherever they came. Mattathias, who was aged, died the

next

next year, and was ſucceeded in the command of the army by his ſon Judas; who took for the motto of his ſtandard,

מי כמכה באלם יהוה

mi camo-ka baelim Jehovah (a),

"Who is like unto thee, O Lord, among the Gods?" This motto is ſaid to have been written, not at length, but only by the firſt letter of each word מכבי; as P. S. Q. R, for populus ſenatuſque romanus, was written on the roman ſtandard. Theſe four initial letters are generally ſuppoſed to have formed the artificial word Maccabi; from whence this Judas has been commonly called Judas Maccabæus, and thoſe that ſided with him, and fought under his ſtandard were termed Maccabees. This is the opinion of Buxtorf, Prideaux, and almoſt all the learned. But Dr. Kennicot doubts of this derivation, ſince in ſome ancient manuſcripts the name is written with a ף inſtead of a כ *. But whatever was the original of the word Maccabæus, it afterwards became a general name for all ſuch as ſuffered in the cauſe of the true religion, under the Egyptian or Syrian kings. Accordingly it is applied by the ancient chriſtian writers to ſome, who died many years before Judas ſet up his ſtandard †.

The

(a) Exod. xv. 11.

* See his ſecond Diſſert. on the State of the printed Hebrew Text. p. 535.

† If the common derivation of the name, Maccabees, be the true one, it was probably the original of artificial names, made of initial letters; which have ſince been much uſed both by Jews and Chriſtians. Thus, among the Jews, Rambam ſignifies Rabbi Moſes Ben Maimon; and Ralbag ſtands for Rabbi Levi Ben Gerſon. We have likewiſe

modern

The Jews enjoyed their liberty under a ſucceſſion of the aſmonean princes, though not without frequent wars and confuſions, for near an hundred years; till Ariſtobulus, endeavouring to wreſt the crown from his elder brother Hyrcanus, raiſed a civil war; which gave the Romans an opportunity to conquer Judea, and to reduce it into the form, firſt, of a tributary kingdom; and afterwards, of a roman province. This brings us to the laſt ſtate of the Jews before their utter deſtruction as a nation.

4thly, They were ſubject to the Romans, and governed by kings appointed by the roman emperors; as by Herod, and afterward, by his ſon Archelaus, and then by a ſucceſſion of roman prefects, till the period of their ſtate and polity, when the "Scepter entirely departed from Judah, and the lawgiver from betwixt his feet," according to Jacob's celebrated prophecy, which Godwin ſpeaks of at the end of his firſt chapter. But as his account of it, and of the controverſies concerning its meaning and accompliſhment, is very imperfect, I ſhall here give a more full and complete one.

Con-

modern inſtances of the ſame ſort of devices in our own country. About the year 1640 there were ſeveral treatiſes publiſhed again Dioceſan Epiſcopacy under the name, Smectymnuus, which was made of the initial letters of the names of five divines, who were the authors of thoſe pieces, Stephen Marſhal, Edmund Calamy, Thomas Young, Matthew Newcomen, and William Spurſtow. The word Cabal is of the ſame kind, being made of the initial letters of the names of five lords in Charles the ſecond's reign, who caballed together, as we may now expreſs it, to make the king abſolute; Clifford, Arlington, Buckingham, Anthony Aſhley Cooper, and Lauderdale.

Concerning Jacob's prophecy.

"The ſceptre ſhall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come, and unto him ſhall the gathering of the people be (*a*)."

And here

1ſt, I will conſider the literal meaning of the words: And

2dly, Their prophetic import,

1ſt, As to the literal meaning of thoſe words, concerning which any doubt has been made, they are theſe four, שבט ſhebhet, the ſceptre; מחקק mechokek, the lawgiver; רגליו raglaiv, his feet; and שילה Shiloh.

The firſt word is שבט ſhebhet, which we tranſlate the ſceptre; for which rendering we have the united authority of the three targums, namely, Onkelos, Jonathan, and the Jeruſalem; beſides a great many of the modern rabbies. But others underſtand by it a tribe, as the ſame word ſometimes ſignifies; particularly in the ſixteenth and twenty-eighth verſes of this very chapter, in which the prophecy we are now conſidering is recorded, and in ſome other places. And ſo they make the meaning of the firſt clauſe to be, "Judah ſhall not ceaſe from being a tribe." Others, again, (chiefly of the modern Jews,) underſtand by שבט ſhebhet, the rod of correction or affliction, as the word ſometimes imports (*b*). Accordingly they make this clauſe to ſignify, Judah ſhall not ceaſe from being an afflicted people. But the peace and proſperity which Judah and all Iſrael have ſome-

(*a*) Gen. xlix. 10. (*b*) Job ix. 34. 2 Sam. vii. 14. Lam. iii. 1.

ſometimes enjoyed, particularly during the reigns of David and Solomon, are a ſufficient objection againſt adopting that ſenſe in this place. The truth is, שבט ſhebhet, from שבט ſhabhat, produxit, to produce, primarily ſignifies a rod or wand, ſhooting from the root of a tree; and in a metaphorical ſenſe, it denotes correction, of which a rod is often the inſtrument; a tribe, which ſprings out of a common ſtock; a ſceptre, and ſeveral other things. The meaning of it, therefore, in any particular place, muſt be determined by the context, and by the ſubject there ſpoken of. Now as the context, immediately preceding this famous prophecy, foretels the dominion of Judah, not only over his enemies, but over his brethren (*a*), nothing can be ſo naturally underſtood by שבט ſhebhet, in this clauſe, as a ſceptre; and ſo it predicts the continuance and duration of that power and authority, which was juſt before promiſed. In this ſenſe the ſame phraſe is uſed, nor is it capable of any other, when it is ſaid, "The ſceptre of Egypt ſhall depart away (*b*)."

The next word to be explained is מחקק mechokek, from חקק chakak, ſcripſit, ſtatuit, mandavit, to ordain, command; which is therefore very properly rendered a lawgiver. However, it ſeems to be a word of a lower ſignification than שבט ſhebhet, which denotes royal authority; as, "he that holdeth the ſceptre," means the king (*c*). Accordingly, the מחקקים mechokekim, mentioned in the book of Judges, are the chief men, or magiſtrates, of the tribes of Iſrael (*d*); who, though they were governors,

(*a*) ver. 8, 9. (*b*) Zech. x. 11. (*c*) Amos i. 5.
(*d*) Judg. v. 9, 14.

nors; as we render the word; yet were not veſted with royal and ſupream authority.

The next word is רגליו raglaiv, his feet; of the literal meaning of which there is no doubt, unleſs we admit the correction of Ludolphus, who for רגליו raglaiv, would read דגליו diglaiv, his banner, agreeable to the ſamaritan copy. But there is no ſufficient reaſon to admit this correction, contrary to the targums, and moſt of the ancient verſions. The phraſe therefore מבין רגליו mibbein raglaiv, either ſignifies, as Waginſeil renders it, even "to the laſt end of his ſtate;" juſt as "the people at the feet," an expreſſion uſed in ſome places (*a*), denotes thoſe that follow, or bring up the rear; or the word מבין mibbein, ſeems to determine רגליו raglaiv, to the ſenſe that is more commonly received, namely, from thy ſeed or poſterity; referring to the ſituation of the parts of generation.

4thly, But the greateſt controverſy of all is about the meaning of the word שילה ſhiloh, which our tranſlators have not ventured to render by any engliſh word, but have retained the original. As it is an απαξ λεγομενον, and nothing in the context will certainly determine from what root it is derived, interpreters are much divided about its ſignification. Le Clerc is for deducing it from the chaldee word שלה ſhelah, ceſſavit, to ceaſe, and ſo makes it to ſignify, the end. Accordingly he repreſents the ſenſe of this prophecy to be, "that from the time the ſceptre came into the tribe of Judah, it will continue in it, till that tribe be at an end." But this opinion has been confuted by Monſieur Saurin *.

The

(*a*) Exod. xi. 8. 2 Kings iii. 9.

* See his diſc. hiſtor. diſc. 41.

The tranſlators of the arabic and ſyriac verſions ſeem to have read שלו ſhelo, illius, his or to him, and ſo render it, "whoſe it is," that is, the kingdom. And not much different is the ſeptuagint verſion, which renders שילה ſhiloh, τα αποκειμενα αυτω, donec veniant quæ repoſita ſunt ei, or according to other copies, ο αποκειται, he for whom it is reſerved. Others derive it from שול ſhil, which they will have to ſignify a ſon, becauſe שליה ſhileiah, ſignifies ſomething that belongs to the birth. But I take the moſt probable opinion to be, either that Shiloh comes from שלח ſhilach, miſit, to ſend, writing ה for ח, and ſo it ſignifies, him that is ſent, or whom God would ſend; under which character our Saviour is often ſpoken of in the New Teſtament; (and this is the opinion of Jerom and Grotius;) or elſe it comes from שלה ſhalah, tranquillus eſt, quievit, and ſo it ſignifies peaceable, or a peace-maker; anſwerable to that name of the Meſſiah שר שלום ſar ſhalom, the prince of peace (*a*). But let the original of the word שילה ſhiloh, be what it will, it is almoſt univerſally acknowledged to mean the Meſſiah; in particular, by all the targums, as well as by many other ancient and modern Jews, as well as Chriſtians. Having thus conſidered the literal meaning of the words of this prophecy, we are

2dly, To enquire into its prophetical import, and the time of its accompliſhment.

According to the learned Joſeph Mede, in his diſcourſe on this prophecy, the ſceptre, and the lawgiver, are pretty much ſynonimous terms

(*a*) Iſa. ix. 6.

terms, importing any power or majeſty of government, under what form or name ſoever; and the meaning of the ſceptre not departing from Judah is, not that it ſhould not ceaſe from having a king, or being a kingdom; but that it ſhould not ceaſe from being a ſtate or body politic, or from having a power of government and juriſdiction within itſelf, till the Meſſiah came. Accordingly it is obſervable, that Judah, with the little appendage of Benjamin, was the only tribe in which the ſceptre did, in this ſenſe, continue to the end of the jewiſh polity. For it entirely departed from the other ten tribes at the Aſſyrian captivity.

As for the laſt clauſe of the prophecy, "to him ſhall the gathering of the people be," Mr. Mede underſtands it of another event, which ſhould alſo be accompliſhed before the ſceptre departed from Judah, namely, the converſion of the Gentiles to the chriſtian faith. When, therefore our Saviour foretels the deſtruction of Jeruſalem and the jewiſh ſtate, he adds, "This goſpel of the kingdom ſhall be preached in all the world, for a witneſs to all nations, and then ſhall the end come (*a*)." But Dr. Patrick inclines to Waginſeil's ſenſe; which is, that there ſhould be, either king, or governor among the Jews till the coming of Chriſt; for the Vau before מחקק mechokek, may as well be underſtood disjunctively as copulatively: In which caſe "the ſceptre" may refer to the royal government in the houſe of David; and the "lawgiver," (which, we obſerved before, is a word of a lower ſignification,) to the form of government under Zerubbabel

(*a*) Matt. xxiv. 14.

rubbabel, the Maccabees, &c. till Judea was made a roman province. For though ſome of theſe governors were not of the tribe of Judah; the Maccabees, for inſtance, who were prieſts of the tribe of Levi; nevertheleſs the tribe of Judah was the centre of the ſtate, or the ſeat of government. And he further obſerves, that theſe two forms of government, ſignified by the ſceptre and the lawgiver, nearly divided the whole time, from the beginning to the end of Judah's authority, into two equal parts, there being a little more then five centuries under each. However, preſently after our Saviour's birth, the Jews loſt even their מחקקים mechokekim, or governors, as they had before loſt the ſceptre; and the adminiſtration of public affairs was no longer in their own hands *.

* Mede's diatribæ, diſc. viii.—Kidder's demonſt. of the Meſſiah, part. 3. chap. 7.—Saurin's diſcourſ. hiſtor. diſc. 41.—Pattick in loc.—Prideaux's connect. ſub. A. C. 8. vol. 4. p. 932. edit. 10.—Biſhop Sherlock's 3d. differt. in his diſc. on prophecy.—Biſhop of Briſtol (Newton) on the propheſies, vol. 1. p. 94, &c.—An account of the various interpretations both of the Jews and Chriſtians may be found, not only in theſe Authors, but in Le Clerc in loc. and eſpecially in Martin. Helvic. de vaticin. Jacobi, apud critic. ſacr. tom. 8.—Huet. demonſt. evang. prop. 9. cap. 4.—Chriſtoph. Cartwright. electa targumico-rabbin. in Gen. and Jacobi Altingii Schilo, ſeu de Patriarchæ Jacobi vaticinio.

On the general ſubject of the preceding chapter, ſee Spencer de Theocratiâ judaicâ; apud Leges hebræor. Witſius de Theocrat. iſraeliticâ; and eſpecially Mr Lowman's civil government of the Hebrews.

CHAP. II.

Of the PUBLICANS.

BEFORE we treat of the publicans, or tax gatherers, it will be proper to premiſe ſomething concerning the jewiſh taxes.

Of the taxes.

It was obſerved in a former lecture, that as the law of Moſes was the only codex juris, or body of law, enacted by God, the king of Iſrael, for the government both of church and ſtate; and as the prieſts were appointed to diſpenſe it; they are properly to be conſidered as miniſters of ſtate, as well as of religion; and therefore the tythes, and the portion of ſacrifices, which the law aſſigned for their maintenance, were in the nature of taxes, payable for the ſupport of the government. Beſides theſe we read of no other ſtated taxes, appointed by the law; except a pole tax of half a ſhekel, which, when they were numbered in the wilderneſs, was levied upon every man from twenty years old and upwards; and it is ſaid to be deſigned for "a ranſom, or atonement for his

his ſoul," and to be "appointed for the ſervice of the tabernacle of the congregation (*a*)." It is not provided that this tax ſhould be paid annually; but being intended for the ranſom of their ſouls, or as an act of homage, and acknowledgment to God, of their being his redeemed people; there was equal reaſon, in the opinion of the jewiſh doctors, for its conſtant ſubſiſtence, as for its original appointment; and being devoted to the ſervice of the tabernacle of the congregation, by which they underſtand their daily ſacrifice and offerings, ſalt for the ſacrifices, wood for the altar of burnt-offering, incenſe, ſhewbread, &c. which were conſtant national charges; from hence they infer that the tax to ſupport them muſt be national, and annual or ſtated. But Grotius is of opinion, that this pole tax, at leaſt in the former ages of the hebrew commonwealth, was not annual; but only levied on peculiar exigences; as when the free-will-offerings, dedicated by the princes and people to maintain the houſe of the Lord, were not ſufficient; (for we read of large donations for that purpoſe in David's time, which ſeem to render this pole tax needleſs (*b*);) or, when ſome extraordinary expence, about the ſanctuary and its ſervice, occurred; as, for repairing the temple in the reign of king Joaſh; who "gathered the prieſts and the levites, and commanded them to collect from all Iſrael money to repair the houſe of the Lord from year to year;" and on account of their dilatorineſs the order being repeated, "proclamation was made through Judah and Jeruſalem, to bring in the collection that Moſes, the ſervant of God, laid

(*a*) Exod. xxx. 12,—16. (*b*) 1 Chron. xxvi. 26, 27.

upon Iſrael in the wilderneſs (*a*)." Now one can hardly ſuppoſe, this tax would have been levied by proclamation, unleſs it had been occaſional and not ſtated and annual. In Nehemiah's time, it was alſo levied by a new ordinance; for which there would have been no occaſion, if the law of Moſes had made it perpetual *. On account of the people's poverty, it was, at this time, lowered from one half to one third of a ſhekel (*b*). This third of a ſhekel Aben-ezra will have to be an additional voluntary contribution, over and above the annual tax of the half ſhekel. But conſidering the low circumſtances the Jews were now in, and how they had been impoveriſhed by the late captivity, that is not probable †.

If we ſuppoſe this pole tax was not, by divine appointment, ſtated and annual; but only levied on publick exigencies; we may, perhaps, be able to account for David's numbring the people being repreſented as ſo heinous a ſin (*c*); for which different interpreters have given very different reaſons.

The common opinion is, that his ſin conſiſted in his pride and vanity, which made him deſirous of knowing how populous and powerful his country was. Ralbag, who is followed by Abarbanel, conceives it lay in making fleſh his arm, and confiding in the multitude of his ſubjects. Some make it conſiſt in infidelity, and miſtruſt of God's promiſe to Abraham, that he would "increaſe his ſeed like the ſtars of heaven, which no man ſhould be able to number (*d*)."

However,

(*a*) 2 Chron. xxiv. 5, 6, 9.
* See Lowman's civil govern. of the Hebr. p. 96. & ſeq.
(*b*) Nehem. x. 32, 33.
† See Aben-ezra in loc. and Grotius on Matt. xvii. 24.
(*c*) 2 Sam. xxiv. 1 Chron. xxi.
(*d*) Gen. xv. 5.

However, if Grotius be right about the pole tax, it may incline one to adopt Dr. Lightfoot's opinion, that "God gave up David to a covetous thought, to number the people, that he might lay a tax upon every pole *." And if ſo, we cannot wonder, his ſin is repreſented as ſo heinous: the guilt was very complicated; being, beſides avarice, a contradiction to the law of God, in levying the tax when there was no occaſion for it; and an act of tyranny and oppreſſion on the people. But to return,

However it was in former times, this tax certainly became annual and ſtated in the later ages of the jewiſh commonwealth; having, perhaps, been made ſo by the aſmonean princes; who being high-prieſts, as well as poſſeſſed of the ſovereign civil authority, would very likely be for increaſing the eccleſiaſtical revenues, by converting that occaſional tax into a ſtated one. We have the teſtimony of Joſephus, that this tax was paid annually; for he ſaith, Veſpaſian commanded every Jew to pay the annual tribute of two drachmæ to the capitol, which had been formerly paid to the temple at Jeruſalem †. Now biſhop Cumberland informs us, that the attick drachm anſwered to the fourth part of the jewiſh ſhekel, which weighed half an ounce avoirdupois ‡; two drachms, therefore, anſwered to the half ſhekel, being in value of our money a little more than one ſhilling and two-pence. Mr.

* Harmony of the Old Teſt. ſub anno mund. 2988. Davidis, 39.

† De bell. Iud. lib. vii. cap. 6. §. 6. edit. Haverc. See alſo Dion Caſſius, lib lxvi. cap. 7. p. 1082. edit. Reimari, 1752.

‡ See his eſſay on jewiſh weights and meaſures, chap. 4.

Selden *, thinks, that this was the tax Cicero refers to, when, in his oration pro Flacco, he ſpeaks of "Gold, ſent every year in the name of the Jews out of Italy, and all the provinces, to Jeruſalem." † This I take to be the tribute which was demanded of Chriſt (*a*); not only becauſe it is called διδραχμα, which ſignifieth two drachms, and ſo anſwereth to the jewiſh half ſhekel; but becauſe the reaſon, which he alledgeth, why he might have excuſed himſelf from paying it (*b*), ſhows, it was a tribute paid, not to the roman emperor, (as Salmaſius thinks ‡,) but to God for the ſervice of his temple: So that Chriſt, being the ſon of God, might have pleaded an exemption.

It may poſſibly be objected, that if this tribute was a ſtated annual tax, payable by every Jew; how came the collectors to enquire of Peter, "Doth not your maſter pay tribute? To this it is replied,

1ſt, They might be in doubt, whether he would chuſe to pay it at Capernaum, where at that time he was, which, very likely, they could not have obliged him to do; or at his own town of Nazareth, or at Jeruſalem. Or

2dly, The meaning of the queſtion may be, whether he would pay it then, on the ſpot. For the doctors tell us, that on the firſt day of the month Adar, notice was given, throughout all the country, for men to make this payment; and officers were appointed to ſit in every city of Judea, to receive it; yet nobody was obliged

* De jure nat. & gent. lib. vi. cap. xviii. apud opera, vol. 1. tom. 1. p. 691. edit. Londini, 1726.

† Ciceronis oper. vol. 5. §. 27. p. 345. edit. Olivet. Genev. 1758.

(*a*) Matt. xvii. 24. (*b*) ver. 25, 26.

‡ Salmaſii ad Johannem Miltonum reſponſio, p. 272.

liged to pay it immediately; but if they did not pay it in a certain prefixed time afterwards, they were then compelled.

Theſe taxes, namely, the tythes, the ſacrifical offerings, and the pole tax of the half ſhekel, (whether annual or occaſional,) are all the taxes expreſsly levied by the moſaic law. We read, indeed, of an extraordinary contribution for the building of the tabernacle, which God ordered Moſes to recommend to the people (*a*); and which they made ſo liberally, that their lawgiver thought proper to reſtrain them by proclamation (*b*). However, this was not in the nature of a tax, but a free gift, every one giving as he pleaſed.

As for the expences of war, in which the Iſraelites were often engaged, it is to be conſidered, that they held their eſtates by military tenure; for it appeareth from the exemptions allowed ſome perſons on particular occaſions, from attending military ſervice (*c*), that all others were bound to attend *. So that the iſraelitiſh troops were a militia, maintained at their own expence; which was the reaſon of Jeſſe's ſending proviſions to his ſons in Saul's army (*d*). There was ordinarily, therefore, no need of taxes to defray the charges of war.

When the Iſraelites came to be governed by kings, who, like other monarchs, affected pomp and magnificence; no doubt, ſome taxes were neceſſary to defray that extraordinary expence, and to ſupport the dignity of the crown; and though theſe taxes were not properly of

(*a*) Exod. xxv. 2. (*b*) Exod. xxxvi. 3,—7.
(*c*) Deut. xx. 5, &c. (*d*) 1 Sam. xvii. 17, 18.
* See Lowman's Civil Govetnment of the Hebrews, chap. 4. p. 52.

God's appointment, any more then the regal government itſelf; yet the Jews look upon this law in the book of Deuteronomy, "Neither ſhall the king greatly multiply to himſelf ſilver and gold (*a*)," as implying a permiſſion to levy neceſſary taxes on the people; only God foreſeeing they would in time change the form of government which he had appointed, into a monarchy like that of other nations, reſtrains their kings by this prohibition, from levying expenſive taxes on the ſubject.

It ſhould ſeem, Solomon did not ſufficiently regard this reſtraint; for he multiplied to himſelf not only "horſes and wives," contrary to the law (*b*); but alſo "ſilver and gold;" ſo that the people groaned under the burden of taxes; which proved the immediate occaſion of the revolt of the ten tribes from his ſon and ſucceſſor Rehoboam (*c*). How theſe taxes were levied does not appear in the ſcripture hiſtory.

After the captivity the Jews were tributary to the Perſians, as is plain from the letter which their enemies wrote to Artaxerxes, to prevent the rebuilding of Jeruſalem; in which they inform him that if the city be built and fortified, then the Jews "will not pay toll, tribute and cuſtom (*d*)." We have no account how the toll tribute, and cuſtom, here mentioned, were levied. By the firſt of theſe words Grotius underſtands a pole tax; by the ſecond, a duty upon commodities and merchandize; and by the third, a tax upon their land; but Witſius, a land tax, or rather a tax on property in general, by the firſt; a pole tax, by the ſecond; and a toll

(*a*) Deut. xvii. 17. (*b*) ver. 16, 17.
(*c*) See 1 Kings xii. 4.
(*d*) Ezra iv. 13.

toll collected on the road, from merchants, who travelled with their goods from place to place, by the third *. However that be, it is probable the whole tribute to the Persian monarch was paid by the chief governor of Judea, out of the taxes which he levied on the subject.

When Pompey conquered Judea, and put an end to the asmonean race of kings, (which Godwin says was about sixty years before Christ,) the Jews became tributary to the Romans. But he is mistaken in supposing, as he seems to have done, that the Publicans, so often mentioned in the New Testament, subsisted among them, immediately from that conquest. For Publicans were tax gatherers in the roman provinces. Now Judea was not reduced into the form of a province till the reign of Augustus, and some years after our Saviour's birth. Till then it was only a dependent kingdom, governed by its own kings; though not, as formerly, natives and chosen by the Jews, but appointed by the roman emperors. Herod, who succeeded Antigonus, the last of the asmonean race, was not a Jew, but an Idumean †.

Archelaus, Herod's son, and successor, having committed many flagrant acts of male administration and tyranny, both the Jews and Samaritans sent ambassadors, to accuse him before Augustus. Upon which he was summoned to Rome, where not being able to clear himself

* Miscell. tom. 2. exercitat. xi. §. xxi. p. 289.

† This hath made some suppose, that the sceptre, departed from Judah, according to Jacob's prophecy, upon the accession of Herod. But that must be a mistake; since he acceded above thirty years before Shiloh, or the Messiah came. The truth is, the sceptre was still amongst them, though he who swayed it, was not a native.

ſelf of the crimes charged upon him, which were fully proved; he was depoſed from his principality after he had reigned ten years. This happened anno Dom. 8. or in the 12th year of our Saviour's age *.

Auguſtus took this opportunity to reduce Judea into the form of a roman province; and ſent Publius Sulpitius Quirinius, afterwards made preſident of Syria, (the ſame who according to the greek way of writing his name, is called Cyrenius by St. Luke (*a*),) to ſeize the country over which Archelaus had reigned; and with him Coponius, a Roman of the equeſtrian order, to take upon him the government, under the title of procurator of Judea, yet in ſubordination to the preſident of Syria. It ſhould ſeem, the emperor had formed this deſign ſeveral years before, when he ordered the publick cenſus, or enrollment, of the ſubjects of the empire to extend to Judea; which occaſioned the virgin Mary's being at Bethlehem at the time of her delivery (*b*). But the reduction of Judea to the form of a province was not till twelve years after; and then taxes were firſt paid by its inhabitants, immediately, to the roman ſtate. For though the people of dependent kingdoms paid them to their own princes, and whatever the Romans received, was from them; yet thoſe of the provinces paid them directly to the roman government, or to the officers, which

* Dionyſius Exiguus a roman abbot, who lived in the ſixth century, and was the author of the Chriſtian Era, fixed it, by miſtake, four years after the birth of Chriſt. See Dupin's hiſtory of eccleſiaſtical writers, cent. 6. p. 42. Dr. Cave's hiſtoria literaria, ſub anno 533. p. 333. edit. Genev. 1720. and Uſſerii annales, ætat. mundi vii. ab init. p. 568. edit. Genev. 1722.

(*a*) Luke ii. 2. (*b*) ver. 1,—5.

which the ſenate appointed to collect and receive them.

The ſubject we have been upon, naturally leads me to conſider a difficulty, which hath occaſioned the learned not a little trouble; the reconciling St. Luke's account of the enrollment, or cenſus of the land of Judea with Joſephus.

Concerning the cenſus in the time of Auguſtus.

According to the jewiſh hiſtorian, Joſephus, Cyrenius was not governor of Syria till ten or twelve years after our Saviour's birth, after Archelaus was depoſed, and the country brought under a roman procurator *; whereas St. Luke ſays, αὕτη ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου: which we render, "And this taxing was firſt made, when Cyrenius was governor of Syria (a);" yet this, according to him, was before the death of Herod, the father and predeceſſor of Archelaus, and in the ſame year when Chriſt was born.

Now as, on the one hand, it cannot be ſuppoſed, that a writer ſo accurate as Luke (were he conſidered only as a common hiſtorian,) ſhould make ſo groſs a miſtake, as to confound the enrollment in the reign of Herod with that taxation under Cyrenius, which happened many years after; ſo, on the other hand, it is hard to conceive that Joſephus ſhould be miſtaken in an affair of ſo publick a nature, ſo important to

* Antiq. lib. xvii. cap. 13. §. 2, 5. & lib. xviii. cap. 1. §. 1. edit. Havere.

(a) Luke ii. 2.

to his own nation, and ſo recent when he wrote his hiſtory. To remove this difficulty,

1ſt, Some have ſuppoſed a corruption of the original text in Luke; and that, inſtead of Cyrenius, it ought to be read Saturninus, who, according to Joſephus, was prefect of Syria within a year or two before Herod's death.

2dly, Others have thought it probable, that the original name in St. Luke was Quintilius; ſince Quintilius Varus ſucceeded Saturninus, and was in the province of Syria when Herod died.

But all the greek manuſcripts remonſtrate againſt both theſe ſolutions. Therefore

3dly, Mr. Whiſton and Dr. Prideaux ſuppoſe that the words, "In thoſe days there went out a decree from Cæſar Auguſtus, that all the world (or as οἰκουμένη may be rendered, the whole land) ſhould be taxed (*a*)," refer to the time of making the cenſus; and the ſubſequent words, "This taxing was firſt made, when Cyrenius was governor of Syria (*b*)," to the time of levying the tax. Dr. Prideaux imagines, this will anſwer all objections *.

4thly, Herwaert and, after him, Dr. Whitby render the text in this manner, "And this taxing was firſt made, before that made when Cyrenius was governor of Syria †."

5thly, Dr. Lardner has given the eaſieſt and beſt ſolution of this Difficulty, rendering the words

(*a*) ver. 1. (*b*) ver. 2.

* Whiſton's ſhort view of the harmony of the evangeliſts, prop. xi. and Prideaux's connect. part ii. book ix. ſub anno 5 before the chriſtian era. vol. 4. p. 917,—922. edit. 10.

† Herwaert's nova & vera chronologia, p. 189. and Whitby in loc.

words thus, "This was the first assessment of Cyrenius governor of Syria." Which version he hath supported, by substantial criticism; and likewise rendered it highly probable, that Cyrenius, (afterward governor of Syria, and at the time St. Luke wrote, well known by that title,) was employed in making the first enrollment of the inhabitants of Judea in the reign of Herod *.

Of the publicans.

Judea being now added to the provinces of the roman empire, and the taxes paid by the Jews, directly to the emperor; the Publicans were the officers appointed to collect them.

Now the ordinary taxes, which the Romans levied in the provinces, were of three sorts:

1st, Customs upon goods imported and exported; which tribute was therefore called portorium, from portus, a haven.

2dly, A tax upon cattle, fed in certain pastures belonging to the roman state; the number of which being kept in writing, this tribute was called scriptura.

3dly, A tax upon corn, of which the government demanded a tenth part. This tribute was called decuma.

We read of φορος and τελος, translated "Tribute and custom (a)." Concerning the precise and distinct meaning of these words the critics are much divided. Grotius makes φορος to signify a tax upon lands and persons; and τελος, custom upon goods and merchandise. Lipsius by

* See credibility of the gosp. history, part 1. vol. 2. book 2. ch. 1.

(a) Rom. xiii. 7.

by φορος underſtands a tax upon a real eſtate; by τελος, a tax upon moveables and perſons. Leigh * ſuppoſes φορος to mean duties upon goods; τελος, a capitation or pole tax. According to Beza, φορος ſignifies a capitation or pole tax, and τελος includes all other taxes and duties. Other critics have given ſtill different accounts. So that in the midſt of ſuch great uncertainty we muſt be content with this general obſervation, that theſe words together include all taxes and duties, though we are unable to aſcertain the preciſe meaning of either of them, or the difference betwixt them. It being highly probable, that the publick taxes varied from one age to another, I ſuſpect, that in different ages, theſe words were applied to different taxes and duties; which occaſions an uncertainty about the preciſe idea to be affixed to them. Perhaps τελος was the more general name, or included the larger number of taxes, at leaſt among the Greeks; which ſeems probable from the collectors, in their language, being called τελωναι: whereas in the Latin they are ſtiled publicani, as being collectors of the publick taxes, or revenue of the ſtate.

Theſe Publicans are diſtinguiſhed by Sigonius, into three ſorts or degrees, the farmers of the revenue, their partners, and their ſecurities †; in which he follows Polybius ‡. Theſe are

* See his critica ſacra, in verb.

† Alii conducebant, alii cum hic ſocietatem coibant, alii pro his bona fortunaſque reipublicæ obligabant. Sigon. de antiq. jure civium Romanorum, lib. ii. cap. iv.

‡ Οι μεν γαρ αγοραζουσι παρα των τιμητων αυτοι τας εκδοσεις· οι δε κοινωνουσι τουτοις· οι δε εγγυωνται τας εγοραζοντας· οι δε παν υσιας διδουσιν περι τουτων εις το δημοσιον. Alii enim à cenſoribus locationes per ſe emunt; alii cum his ſocietatem habent;

are called the Mancipes, Socii and Prædes; who were all under the Quæſtores Ærarii, that preſided over the finances at Rome. The Mancipes farmed the revenue of large diſtricts or provinces, had the overſight of the inferior publicans, received their accounts and collections, and tranſmitted them to the Quæſtores Ærarii. They often let out their provinces in ſmaller parcels to the Socii *; ſo called, becauſe they were admitted to a ſhare in the contract, perhaps for the ſake of more eaſily raiſing the purchaſe money; at leaſt, to aſſiſt in collecting the tribute. Both the Mancipes and Socii are therefore properly ſtiled τελωναι, from τελος tributum, and ωνεομαι emo. They were obliged to procure prædes or ſureties †, who gave ſecurity to the government for the fulfillment of the contract ‡. The diſtribution of Sigonius, therefore, or rather of Polybius, is not quite exact; ſince there were properly but two ſorts of Publicans, the Mancipes and the Socii.

The former are, probably, thoſe whom the Greeks call αρχιτελωναι; of which ſort was Zaccheus (*a*). As they were much ſuperior to the common

bent; alii pro redemptoribus fidem ſuam interponunt; alii horum nomine bona ſua in publicum addicunt. Polyb. hiſtor. lib. vi. tom. 1. p. 646. edit. Gronov. Amſtel. 1670.

* We meet frequently in Cicero with the Socii, and the publicanorum ſocietates: orat. pro domo ſuâ, vol 5. §. 28. p. 472. edit. Olivet. and with the principes or magiſtri ſocietatum, who were the mancipes, orat. pro Planc. vol. 5. §. 9. p. 545. & §. 13. p. 548. & epiſt. famil. lib. 13. epiſt. 9. and the Digeſts mention the Socii vectigalium, lib. 39. tit. 4. leg. 9. §. 4.

† Called Fidejuſſores in the Digeſts, ubi ſupra, leg. 9. ab init.

‡ Præs ſignifies a ſurety for money, as vas does a ſurety in criminal matters. (*a*) Luke xix. 2.

common Publicans in dignity, being moſtly of the equeſtrian order; ſo they were generally in their moral character. They are mentioned with great reſpect and honour by Cicero; flos, ſaith he, equitum romanorum, ornamentum civitatis, firmamentum reipublicæ, publicanorum ordine continetur*: He likewiſe calls them "ordinem mihi commendatiſſimum †." But as for the common Publicans, the collectors or receivers, as many of the Socii were, they are ſpoke of with great contempt, by Heathens as well as Jews; and particularly by Theocritus, who ſaid, that "among the beaſts of the wilderneſs, bears and lions are the moſt cruel; among the beaſts of the city, the Publican and Paraſite ‡." The reaſon of the general hatred to them was, doubtleſs, their rapine and extortion. For having a ſhare in the farm of the tribute, at a certain rate, they were apt to oppreſs the people with illegal exactions, to raiſe as large a fortune as they could for themſelves. Beſides, Publicans were particularly odious to the Jews, who looked upon them to be the inſtruments of their ſubjection to the roman emperors; to which they generally held it ſinful for them to ſubmit. For among the laws in Deuteronomy concerning the kings, there is in particular the following, "One from among thy

* Orat. pro Plancio, apud opera, vol. 5. §. 9. p. 544. edit. Olivet.

† Epiſt. famil. lib. 13. epiſt. 10. apud op. vol. 7. p. 442. Vid. etiam epiſt. 9. per totum, & epiſt. ad Attic. lib. 1. epiſt. 17. vol. 8. p. 80.

‡ Vid. Hammond on Matt. ix. 10.

The twelfth law, under the fourth title, in the thirty-firſt book of the Digeſts is prefaced with theſe remarkable words, Quantæ audaciæ, quantæ temeritatis ſint publicanorum factiones, nemo eſt qui neſciat.

thy brethren ſhalt thou ſet over thee; thou mayeſt not ſet a ſtranger over thee who is not thy brother (*a*)." Now paying tribute to the roman emperor they looked upon to be a virtual acknowledgment of his ſovereignty. This therefore was a heavy grievance, and created an averſion to the collectors, as the inſtruments of illegal oppreſſion, apart from all conſideration of their rapacious practices. Accordingly, in the New Teſtament, we find them joined with harlots and heathens, and perſons of the moſt profligate and infamous characters; and it was intended for a ſevere reproach of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, when he was ſaid to be "a friend of Publicans and Sinners (*b*)." Hence that enſnaring queſtion was put to him, with a deſign "to entangle him in his talk (*c*)," "Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæſar?" If he had denied it, it would have been judged an offence againſt the ſtate; and if he had affirmed it, it would probably have expoſed him to the rage and reſentment of the people. It was on pretence of freeing them from this tributary yoke, that Judas of Galilee, (or as Joſephus calls him,) Judas Gaulanites, excited an "Inſurrection in the days of the taxing, and drew away much people after him (*d*)." Of this Joſephus gives a particular account *, and ſaith, that when the cenſus was firſt extended to Judea by Cyrenius, after Archelaus had been depoſed by Auguſtus, the Jews were greatly chagrined at it; but at the perſwaſion of Joazar, the high-prieſt, they generally ſubmitted. Yet, it ſeems, much againſt their wills; for when this Judas

(*a*) Deut. xvii. 15. (*b*) Luke vii. 34. (*c*) Matt. xxii. 15, 17. (*d*) Acts v. 37.

* Antiq. lib. xviii. cap. 1. §. 1. edit. Havere.

excited the people to rebellion, and to assert their liberty, they heard him, (saith the historian,) "with incredible pleasure," and made an insurrection on that account, under him as their leader.

Tertullian * imagined, that the Publicans, among the Jews, were all Heathens. Which, not understanding Hebrew, he grounded on a spurious text in the septuagint †. This opinion is confuted by the instances of Matthew and Zaccheus; who both appear to be Jews, by their names, and their history. The latter is expressly said to be a son of Abraham; and as for Matthew, we may be assured, that our Lord, who, at present, was sent to none but the lost sheep of the house of Israel, would not have made an apostle of a Gentile. However, the Jews, who accepted the office of Publicans, were on that account hated of their own nation equally with Heathens, with whom they are sometimes ranked (*a*); and according to the rabbies, it was a maxim, "A religious man, who becomes a Publican, is to be driven out of the society of religion ‡."

* De pudicitiâ, §. ix. p. 561. C. edit. Rigalt.

† Deut. xxiii. 18. in the Greek. The words are, ουκ εσται τελισφος εκ θυγατερων Ισραηλ, και ουκ εσται τελισκομενος εκ υιων Ισραηλ. They were probably at first a gloss in the margin, or inserted in the text of the seventy from some other version; and are strangely misunderstood by Tertullian, who supposes τελισφος to signify in this place, a Publican or tax gatherer, which it most commonly does; but here it means a prostitute for hire, such as in the pagan mysteries raised contributions by their lewdness. See Grotius and Le Clerc in loc.

(*a*) Matt. xviii. 17.

‡ See Lightfoot, Horæ Heb. on Matt. xviii. 17.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

ISRAELITES and PROSELYTES.

GODWIN diſtinguiſhes the people of Iſrael into two ſorts, Hebrews and Proſelytes. We may properly advance a ſtep higher, and divide the whole world, after the commonwealth of Iſrael had been formed, into Jews and Gentiles.

The Jews, or Iſraelites, were thoſe members of the hebrew republic who worſhiped the one true God according to the moſaic ritual; all others they called גוים goim, Gentiles, and אמים ummim, the people, meaning, of the world (*a*). In the New Teſtament they are ſtilled Ελληνες Greeks (*b*). When Greeks are oppoſed to barbarians *, the term ſignifies, the learned, as diſtinguiſhed from the illiterate, part of mankind; the Greeks in thoſe days being looked

 upon

(*a*) Pſal. ii. 1. (*b*) Rom. i. 16. and chap. ii. 9, 10.

* As by St. Paul, Rom. i. 14. and by heathen authors: αντικειται γαρ τω Ελληνι ο Βαρβαρος, "The barbarian is oppoſed to the Greek." Thucyd. lib. 1. §. 3. Schol. 5. p. 3. edit. Hudſ. Oxon. 1696. διχα διαιρουντας απαν το των ανθρωπων πληθος εις τε Ελληνας και βαρβαρους, "dividing the whole world into Greeks and barbarians." Strab. lib. 2. p. 45. edit. Caſaub. Paris 1620.

upon as people of the moſt erudition, or at leaſt their language being eſteemed the moſt improved and polite. But when Greeks are oppoſed to Jews, they include the whole heathen world, of which the Greeks were the moſt conſiderable. Some have imagined, that the triple diſtinction which St. Paul makes (*a*), "there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond or free, there is neither male nor female;" refers to a form of thankſgiving, which the Jews are ſaid to have repeated in their daily prayers; wherein they gave thanks to God for theſe three things,—that he had made them Jews, and not Gentiles:—that he had made them free, and not bond-men, or ſlaves:—that he had made them men, and not women. Inſtead of the third article, the women thanked God, that he had made them as it pleaſed him. If this form was indeed as ancient as the time of the apoſtle, it may naturally be ſuppoſed that he referred to it in this paſſage, where he is ſhowing that the peculiar prerogatives and privileges, which the Jews enjoyed under the Old Teſtament, were by the goſpel equally extended to the Gentiles; and that all who believe in Chriſt, without regard to their nation, worldly condition or ſex, are admitted into his church, and made partakers of his ſalvation.

We now come to conſider the diſtinction of the members of the commonwealth of Iſrael, into Hebrews and Proſelites.

1ſt, As to the Hebrews:——The learned are divided concerning the derivation and meaning of this word, which ſo often occurs both in

(*a*) Gal. iii. 28.

in the Old and New Teſtament. We find it firſt applied to Abraham (*a*); and in a multitude of places to his poſterity, to diſtinguiſh them from all other people; particularly, from the Egyptians (*b*), and the Philiſtines (*c*).

The more common opinion concerning its meaning, maintained by the jewiſh rabbies, and eſpouſed by Buxtorff the ſon *, is,

1ſt, That it is Appellatio patronymica, a family name, from Eber, who was the great grandſon of Shem, and Abraham's great, great, great, great grandfather; that is, he was a lineal deſcendant from Eber in the ſeventh generation †.

Two queries will naturally be ſtarted upon this opinion:

1ſt, Why Abraham and his poſterity ſhould take their name from ſo remote a progenitor, as Eber? or if from a remote one, why not from Shem, the firſt father and founder of the family after Noah?

2dly, Why this appellation ſhould be given to Abraham and his family, rather than to any other of Eber's poſterity?

In anſwer to the firſt query, the rabbies tell us, that Eber was a man of ſingular piety, that the primitive religion and language were preſerved by him and his family; and that Abraham and his poſterity are called Hebrews, becauſe they ſpoke the ſame language, and profeſſed and practiſed the ſame religion that Eber did.

(*a*) Gen. xiv. 13. (*b*) Gen. xliii. 32.
(*c*) 1 Sam. iv. 9.

* See his diſſert. de linguæ hebraicæ conſervatione, apud diſſertationes philolog. theolog. p. 147. Baſil. 1662.

† See the genealogy of Abraham's family, Gen. xi. 10, &c.

But this reaſon ſeems to have its principal foundation in the national pride of the Jews, who would have us believe, that their language was ſpoke in paradiſe, and their anceſtors peculiarly favoured of God above all other people, even long before the call of Abraham. But Le Clerc has rendered it highly probable, that the Hebrew was the language of the Canaanites, and that Abraham, whoſe original tongue was the Chaldee, (for he came out of Ur of the Chaldees (*a*)) learnt it, as Iſaac and Jacob and their families did, by dwelling in the land of Canaan *. However that be, it remains to be proved, that the hebrew language is the ſame which Eber ſpoke. What they ſay of his ſingular piety, is gratis dictum; and their account of the true religion being preſerved in his family down to Abraham's time, by no means agrees with Joſhua's ſaying, that the anceſtors of the Iſraelites, who in old time dwelt "on the other ſide of the flood," even Terah "the father of Abraham, ſerved other gods (*b*)."

The ſecond query is, Why the name Hebrew ſhould be given to Abraham and his family, rather than to any other of Eber's poſterity? for Eber had other ſons and daughters, beſides Peleg, his ſon in the line of Abraham (*c*).

The common reply is, becauſe the bleſſings of the covenant of grace were limited to that line of Eber's poſterity, which reached down to Abraham. On this account, as it is ſuppoſed, Shem is called "the father of the children of Eber;" and not ſo much, becauſe he was

(*a*) Gen. xv. 7.

* See his Prolegom. to the Pentateuch, Diſſ. 1.

(*b*) Joſh. xxiv. 2. (*c*) Gen. xi. 17.

was their natural progenitor; which he was, likewiſe, of many other families and nations. And as the poſterity of Iſaac and Jacob, and not that of Iſhmael and Eſau, are called the children of Abraham, ſo the poſterity of Eber are the children of Shem κατ' ἐξοχην.

Still the idolatry of Abram's nearer progenitors may be urged as an objection, and it is reaſonable to aſk, whether the bleſſings of the covenant were continued to thoſe fathers or anceſtors of Abraham, who ſerved other gods? Indeed, that they were limited to Shem's poſterity in the line of Eber, before the calling of Abraham, is gratis dictum. This opinion alſo of the rabbies ſavours too much of the beforementioned pride. But,

2dly, There is another opinion concerning this appellation as applied to Abraham and his poſteriry, which hath a greater appearance of probability: that it comes from the prepoſition עבר gnebher, trans; from whence thoſe that lived beyond, or to the Eaſt, of the river Euphrates, were called by the Canaanites and others who lived on the Weſt, עברים gnibhrim. Thus Abraham's family, before his call into Canaan, is ſaid to have dwelt בעבר הנהר bengnebher hannahar, trans fluvium (*a*); meaning beyond the river Euphrates; which being the greateſt river in that part of the world, or that was known to the ancient inhabitants of the adjacent countries, they uſed to call it "the river" κατ' ἐξοχην. And the people, who lived Eaſt or Weſt of it, ſtiled thoſe on the other ſide, "the people beyond the river," that is, Trans-Euphratenſes. Thus the enemies of the

(*a*) Joſh. xxiv. 2.

Jews, who wrote from Judea to king Artaxerxes in Babylon, ſtiled themſelves "thy ſervants on this ſide of the river (*a*); and the king in his anſwer directs to them "beyond the river (*b*)." In the chaldee, indeed, the phraſe is the ſame in both places עבר נהרה gnabhar naharah, trans fluvium; and elſewhere we meet with this expreſſion, Hadarezer "brought out the Aſſyrians that were beyond the river (*c*)." Now it is according to this phraſeology, ſo common in ſcripture, that Le Clerc underſtands the account we have, that "Shem was the father of all the children of Eber (*d*)," that is of all the people, who dwelt Eaſt of the Euphrates; tranſlating כל בני עבר col bene gnebher, omnes qui trans fluvium degunt. He takes בני עבר bene gnebher, to be a Hebraiſm, denoting the inhabitants of the country beyond the Euphrates. So the ſenſe of the text is, that all this eaſtern part of the world was peopled by Shem's poſterity.

It is ſuppoſed that the Canaanites called Abraham in their language, the Hebrew, becauſe he came בעבר bengnebher, from beyond the river. Thus Joſephus ſays, that Niger, the preſident of Idumea, was called Περαίτης, becauſe γένος ἦν ἐκ τῆς περὶ Ἰορδάνην περαίας, quod a trans-jordanenſi regione oriundus eſſet *. And hence the poſterity of Abraham acquired the appellation of עברים gnibhrim, or Hebrews.

It is evident the ſeventy underſtood the word in this ſenſe, for they tranſlate Abraham the Hebrew (*e*), Abraham περάτης, tranſitor. Thus, among

(*a*) Ezra iv. 11. (*b*) ver. 17. (*c*) 2 Sam. x. 16.
(*d*) Gen. x. 21.
* De bello Jud. lib. ii. cap. xx. §. 4. edit. Haverc.
(*e*) Gen. xiv. 13.

among the ancients, Theodoret *, and Jerom †, as well as ſome others ‡; and among the moderns, Grotius and Le Clerc underſtand the word Hebrew.

On the whole, according to this opinion, Hebrew ſignifies much the ſame as foreigner, among us; or one that comes from beyond ſea. Such were Abraham and his family among the Canaanites; and his poſterity, learning and uſing the language of the country, ſtill retained the appellation originally given them, even when they became poſſeſſors and ſettled inhabitants. In which circumſtance the church of Iſrael was, in ſome ſort, a type of that larger church of the Gentiles, which was to be called and gathered to Chriſt, and "to forget her own people and her father's houſe (*a*);" as Abraham's family, being called out of an idolatrous nation, no longer retained the name of the people from whence they ſprung, but were afterwards called Hebrews, or foreigners.

It is further very probable, that the Iſraelites being called גרים Gerim, ſtrangers in David's time (*b*), might refer to their father's having come into the country over the גר gar, alveus, that is, the Euphrates.

It is however objected to this opinion,

1ſt, That according to this ſenſe of the word, the poſterity of Iſhmael, and Eſau, might as well have been called Hebrews, as the poſterity of Iſaac and Jacob; they being equally the poſterity

* In Gen. quæſt. 60.

† In Iſai. xix. 18.

‡ See Buxtorfii Differt. Philolog. theolog. diſſert. iii. p. 141, 142.

(*a*) Pſal. xlv. 10. (*b*) 1 Chron. xxix. 15.

poſterity of Abraham the foreigner, who came בעבר bengnebher, from beyond the river.

To this it may be replied, that very probably, they were called Hebrews, while they continued in Abraham's family; but afterward, when they ſeparated themſelves from it, and were incorporated into the Canaanitiſh and other nations by intermarriage, they were no longer looked upon as foreigners, and ſo loſt that name. Beſides, there were perſonal reaſons for Abraham and Iſaac and Jacob being called Hebrews, which did not affect either Iſhmael or Eſau. Abraham was born beyond the river, where he paſt the younger part of his life. Iſaac would not marry a Canaanite, but went beyond the river for a wife. Jacob did the ſame, and dwelt there for upwards of twenty years; and there all his children, except one, were born. But none of theſe reaſons held for continuing the ſame appellation to Iſhmael and Eſau, and their poſterity.

2dly, It is objected, that the word Hebrew is a name or title of honour. As ſuch St. Paul uſes it (*a*): "Are they Hebrews? ſo am I." And can we ſuppoſe, that Jews would glory in being foreigners, and in their anceſtors coming out of an idolatrous country?

To this it may be anſwered, that names are often uſed in a good, or bad ſenſe, very different from the import of their derivation. The word knave hath now a very bad meaning, though it is derived from gnavus, diligent or active; and though formerly it ſignified a ſervant, in whom diligence is a very good quality. Who, when he glories in being an Engliſhman,

(*a*) 2 Cor. xi. 22.

liſhman, conſidereth the derivation, and original ſignification, of the word, Engliſh? Beſides, it was really an honour to the Jews, that God was pleaſed to call Abraham, the father and founder of their nation, out of an idolatrous country, in which he had been born and educated; and to ſeparate him and his poſterity from all other nations, to be his peculiar people, and viſible church.

A further reaſon of St. Paul's glorying in his being an Hebrew; and conſequently a further anſwer to this objection, will be ſhortly produced.

3dly, Another objection againſt the ſecond, and in favour of the firſt opinion, is taken from Balaam's prophecy: "And ſhips ſhall come from the coaſt of Chittim, and ſhall afflict Aſhur, and ſhall afflict Eber (*a*);" two branches of Shem's family (*b*). Now if it be admitted, that the Aſſyrians were called by the name of Aſhur, becauſe he was their primogenitor; can it be reaſonably denied, or doubted, that the Jews are called Hebrews from Eber?

I reply, If by Eber be, in this place, meant the Jews, this argument will have conſiderable weight. But if the prophecy refers to Alexander's conqueſt, which Grotius ſays, is very plain, quod nemo non videt; then Eber cannot here mean the people of Iſrael, ſince they were not afflicted by Alexander, as other nations were; but remarkably and miraculouſly preſerved from his ravages. If therefore we take the word Eber to come from עבר gnebher, trans, it muſt here mean, as Grotius and Le Clerc underſtand it,

(*a*) Numb. xxiv. 24. (*b*) Gen. x. 22, 24.

it, the other nations, (as well as the Aſſyrians,) that lay East of the river Euphrates.

Thus much for the derivation and import of the word, Hebrew.

There is a very remarkable appellation which the apoſtle Paul, after glorying in his being "of the ſtock of Iſrael, and of the tribe of Benjamin," applies to himſelf; namely, that he was an "Hebrew of the Hebrews (*a*)." By this expreſſion Godwin underſtands, an Hebrew both by father's and mother's ſide. But if this be all that the phraſe imports, there ſeems to be very little occaſion for the apoſtle's uſing it immediately after having declared, that he was "of the ſtock of Iſrael, and the tribe of Benjamin;" which on Godwin's ſuppoſition, is the ſame as an Hebrew of the Hebrews; for the Jews were not allowed to marry out of their own nation: or if they ſometimes married proſelytes, yet their number was comparatively ſo ſmall among them, eſpecially while they were under oppreſſion, as they were at that time by the Romans; that methinks, Paul would hardly have mentioned it as a diſtinguiſhing privilege and honour, that neither of his parents were proſelytes. It is therefore a much more probable ſenſe, that a Hebrew of the Hebrews ſignifies a Hebrew both by nation and language, which multitudes of Abraham's poſterity, in thoſe days, were not; or one of the Hebrew Jews who performed their publick worſhip in the Hebrew tongue; for ſuch were reckoned more honourable than the helleniſtic Jews, who in their diſperſion having, in a manner, loſt the Hebrew, uſed the Greek language in ſacris, and

(*a*) Phil. iii. 5.

and read the ſcripture out of the ſeptuagint verſion. We meet with this diſtinction amongſt the converted Jews, in the acts of the apoſtles: "In thoſe days, when the number of the diſciples was multiplied, there aroſe a murmuring of the Grecians or Helleniſts againſt the Hebrews (*a*)." This is what St. Paul probably meant by his being a Hebrew, as diſtinguiſhed from an Iſraelite (*b*): Are they Hebrews? So am I. Are they Iſraelites? So am I. In one ſenſe, theſe were convertible terms, both ſignifying Jews by nation and religion; but in the ſenſe juſt mentioned, there were many, in thoſe days, who were Iſraelites, but not Hebrews. St. Paul was both; not only an Iſraelite by birth, but a Hebrew, and not an helleniſtic Jew.

Godwin expreſſes himſelf inaccurately, when he ſaith, that thoſe who lived in Paleſtine, and who, as uſing the hebrew text in their publick worſhip, were oppoſed to the Ελληνισαι, are called Hebrews, OR JEWS. For, though Hebrew and Jew are convertible terms, when oppoſed to Gentiles, as denoting the ſeed of Abraham, and profeſſors of the moſaic religion (*c*); yet as oppoſed to the Ελληνισαι, they are not convertible terms, there being Hebrew Jews and helleniſtic Jews; for it is ſaid, that when "they, who were ſcattered by the perſecution that aroſe about Stephen, travelled into ſeveral countries, preaching the word to none but Jews only;" yet they ſpoke προς τους Ελληνισας, to the Helleniſts or Grecians (*d*) †.

In

(*a*) Acts vi. 1. (*b*) 2 Cor. xi. 22.
(*c*) See Jer. xxxiv. 9. (*d*) Acts xi. 19, 20.
† In the ſtricteſt ſenſe this appellation יְהוּדִים Jehudim, Ιουδαιοι, or Jews belongs only to the poſterity and tribe of Judah.

In order to confirm the ſenſe which I have given of the word Ελληνισται, in oppoſition to the appellation, Hebrews, it is proper we ſhould take notice of the diſtinction between the Ελληνες and Ελληνισται. The former were Greeks by nation, and as ſuch diſtinguiſhed from Jews (c); and the greek empire having been rendred by Alexander, in a manner univerſal, and their language being then the moſt common and general, the appellation Greeks is ſometimes given to the whole heathen world, or to all who were not Jews (d).

Theſe Greeks, called Ελληνικοι by Joſephus, are always ſtilled Ελληνες in the New Teſtament. On which account Grotius, underſtanding by the Ελληνισται, or "Grecians, to whom ſome of theſe who were diſperſed on the perſecution which aroſe about Stephen, preached the Lord Jeſus

Judah. Hebrews, in the full extent of the word, were the poſterity of Abraham, the Hebrew; Iſraelites, the poſterity of Jacob, or Iſrael; and Jews, the poſterity of Judah, one of the ſons of Iſrael. But after the diviſion of Abraham's and Iſrael's poſterity into two kingdoms, under Rehoboam and Jeroboam, the one was called the kingdom of Judah, becauſe the tribe of Judah had the greater part of it, and alſo becauſe the kings were of that tribe; the other, conſiſting of ten tribes, was called the kingdom of Iſrael. From hence aroſe a diſtinction betwixt Jews and Iſraelites. Thus, by the Jews which the king of Aſſyria drove from Elath (a), are meant the ſubjects of the kingdom of Judah; for to that kingdom Elath had been reſtored by Azariah, ſome years before (b). But as the ten tribes were afterwards, in a manner, loſt in the Aſſyrian captivity, (as hath been ſhown before,) and the kingdom of Judah only continued through ſucceeding ages a body politic, the name Jews came to be applied indifferently, to all Hebrews and Iſraelites.

(a) 2 Kings xvi. 6. (b) chap. xiv. 22.

(c) Acts xvi. 1. xix. 10. (d) Rom. i. 16. ii. 9.

Jeſus (*a*)," Greeks by nation, concludes there is a miſtake in the text, and alters it according to the ſyriac and vulgate verſions: certe legendum, ſaith he, προς τους Ελληνας. So indeed the alexandrian manuſcript reads; but is ſupported by no other copy. And which, I think, is deciſive againſt it, it is evident from the words immediately preceding, that theſe Grecians were by nation Jews, and not Greeks; it being expreſsly ſaid, that thoſe who were ſcattered on the perſecution, "preached the goſpel to the Jews only." As for the Ελληνες or Greeks, mentioned in St. John's goſpel (*b*), as being come to Jeruſalem at the paſſover to worſhip in the temple; and likewiſe thoſe mentioned in the Acts, as worſhiping along with the Jews in their ſynagogues (*c*), they were doubtleſs Greeks by birth and nation, yet proſelytes to the jewiſh religion. There is a diſtinction made betwixt Jews and Proſelytes (*d*), but none betwixt Hebrews and Proſelytes; becauſe a Proſelyte might be either an Hebrew, or an Helleniſt, according to the language in which he performed publick worſhip.

That the Helleniſts, or Grecians, were Jews, is further argued from the account we have (*e*), that when at Jeruſalem, St. Paul "diſputed againſt the Grecians, they went about to ſlay him;" as the Jews at Damaſcus had done before (*f*). Now had theſe Grecians been ſtrangers of a different nation, it cannot be imagined they durſt have attempted to kill a Jew, among his own countrymen, in the capital, and without

(*a*) Acts xi. 19, 20. (*b*) John xii. 20. (*c*) Acts xiv. 1. xviii. 4. (*d*) Acts ii. 10. (*e*) chap. ix. 29. (*f*) ver. 23.

without a formal accuſation of him before any of their tribunals?

Upon the whole, the Ελληνισται, or Grecians, being Jews who uſed the Greek tongue in their ſacred exerciſes, the Hebrew Jews, and Grecian Jews, were diſtinguiſhed in thoſe days, in like manner as the Portugueſe and Dutch Jews are among us, not ſo much by the place of their birth, (many being born in England, others abroad) as by the language they uſe in their public prayers and ſermons.

I have already obſerved, that the language, which the Grecians uſed in ſacris, was that of the ſeptuagint; which is likewiſe the language of the New Teſtament. It hath been, therefore, by ſome called the helleniſtic tongue, to diſtinguiſh it from pure Greek; while others, rejecting the diſtinction, aſſert the purity of the New Teſtament Greek. A conſiderable diſpute hath hereupon ariſen in the learned world; with which it is proper we ſhould not be unacquainted.

Concerning the language of the New Teſtament.

Scaliger, obſerving that the phraſeology in the New Teſtament agrees with that of the ſeptuagint, calls it the helleniſtic dialect. Heinſius imagined it to be a language different from the pure Greek, as the Italian is from the Latin, and peculiar to the Helleniſts; a people, he ſuppoſes, who dwelt in Aſia, and in ſeveral of thoſe eaſtern parts. He was oppoſed by

Salmaſius

Salmaſius *. Phochenius, alſo, engaged in this controverſy, and maintained the purity of the New Teſtament Greek. To him Gataker replied in his piece de ſtylo novi Teſtamenti.

The common opinion is, that the Greek of the New Teſtament is neither pure, nor a new language; but may properly be called the helleniſtic dialect; inaſmuch as the words are ſometimes uſed in a different ſenſe, and different conſtruction, from what they are in other authors. There is, alſo, a mixture of Latin, Perſic, and Syro-chaldaic words, beſides Soleciſms and Hebraiſms.

1ſt, The following latin words are mentioned; κοδραντης, quadrans (a); κηνσος, cenſus (b); δηναριον, denarius (c); λεγιων, legio (d); πραιτωριον, prætorium (e); κυστωδια, cuſtodia (f); σπεκουλατωρ, ſpiculator (g); κεντυριων, centurio (h); κολωνια, colonia (i); σουδαριον, ſudarium (k); μακελλον, macellum (l); μεμβρανα, membrana (m).

Inſtances of latin phraſes are συμβουλιον λαβειν, concilium capere (n); εργασιαν δουναι, operam dare (o). Beſides Latin there are

2dly, Perſic words; as μαγοι, magi (p); γαζα, theſaurus (q), (the proper greek word is θησαυρος)

* Hebræus nomen gentis eſt, ſaith Salmaſius, Helleniſtes Dialecti. Hoc convenit omnibus hominibus græcè ſcientibus & loquentibus, quia gentem non denotat, ſed omnem hominem ελληνιζοντα. De linguâ helleniſtica comment, p. 191. edit. Lugd. Bat. 1643. in ſupport of which piece he publiſhed the ſame year his Funus linguæ helleniſticæ, againſt Heinſius's Exercitat. de Helleniſtis & ling. helleniſt.

(a) Matt. v. 26. (b) chap. xvii. 25. (c) chap. xviii. 28. (d) chap. xxvi. 53. (e) chap. xxvii. 27. (f) ver. 65. (g) Mark vi. 27. (h) chap. xv. 39. (i) Acts xvi. 12. (k) chap. xix. 12. (l) 1 Cor. x. 25. (m) 2 Tim. iv. 13. (n) Matt. xii. 14. (o) Luke xii. 58. (p) Matt. ii. 1. (q) Acts viii. 27.

ρος); and likewiſe γαζοφυλακιον (a). There are alſo,

3dly, Syro-chaldaic words; as Αββα (b), Ακελδαμα (c), βηθσαιδα (d), Εφφαθα (e), Γολγοθα (f), κορβαν (g), μαμμα (b): and whole ſentences; as Ελωι, Ελωι, λαμμα σαβαχθανι (i): μαραν αθα (k): Ταλιθα, κουμι (l).

Various inſtances of ſoleciſms are alledged; as, η καινη διαθηκη εν τω αιματι μου, το υπερ υμων εκχυνομενον, for εκχυνομενη, which it ſhould be in regular conſtruction with τω αιματι (m). And the following, απο Ιησου Χριστου, ο μαρτυς, ο πιστος—τω αγαπησαντι ημας—και εποιησαν ημας, &c. (n). Again, ο νικων, δωσω αυτω, &c (o). In like manner, ο νικων, ποιησω αυτον στυλον, &c (p). And alſo την δοξαν αυτου,—πληρης χαριτος, &c. (q)

Several methods have been taken to make out the grammatical conſtruction of theſe paſſages. But the attempt is needleſs; Gataker* having ſhown, that ſuch ſoleciſms are common in the pureſt greek writers. And indeed, they are often looked upon as beauties, rather than blemiſhes.

Hebraiſms are obſerved in abundance, and that both in words and phraſes, in conſtruction and in figures.

In the firſt place, hebraiſms in ſingle words are of three ſorts:—ſuch as are properly of a hebrew extract:—ſuch as are indeed of a greek extract, but uſed in a different ſenſe from what they

(a) John viii. 20. (b) Mark xiv. 36. (c) Acts i. 19. (d) John v. 2. (e) Mark vii. 34. (f) Matt. xxvii. 33. (g) Mark vii. 11. (b) Matt. v. 22. (i) Mark xv. 34. (k) 1 Cor. xvi. 22. (l) Mark. v. 41. (m) Luke xxii. 20. (n) Rev. i. 5, 6. (o) chap iii. 21. (p) ver. 12. (q) John i. 14.

* Annot. in Marc. Antonin. lib. iii. §. 4.

they are in other authors, and in a manner conformable to the Hebrew:—And words, new coined, to tranſlate hebrew words by.

1ſt, There are words of an hebrew extract, which have either a greek termination, as Μεσσιας (a), Σατανας (b), Σικερα (c), potus inebrians, from שכר ſhechar; or others, which retain the hebrew termination, as Αλληλουια (d), σαβαωθ (e), Αβαδδων (f).

2dly, There are greek words, uſed in a different ſenſe from what they are in other authors, and in a manner conformable to the Hebrew; as βιβλος for a catalogue, like ספר ſepher; βιβλος γενεσεως Ιησυ Χριστυ (g), ספר תולדת אדם ſepher toledhoth Adam (h). Εις, μια, εν, is always a cardinal, except in the New Teſtament; where it is frequently an ordinal, like אחד achedh, in Hebrew; as, της μιας σαββατων (i), primo die hebdomadis, or πρωτη σαββατυ, as it is preſently after explained (k):—Κατα μιαν σαββατων (l): Like באחר לחדש beechadh lachodeſh, the firſt day of the month.—Ρημα in Greek ſignifies a word, but in the New Teſtament it ſometimes ſignifies a thing; like דבר dhabhar; οτι ουκ αδυνατησει παρα τω Θεω παν ρημα (m).—Αποκρινομαι ſignifies properly, to anſwer when another hath already ſpoken; but in the New Teſtament it is uſed for taking occaſion to ſpeak, without having been ſpoken to; like ענה gnanah in Hebrew; Και αποκριθεις ο Ιησους ειπεν αυτη, nempe συκην· Μηκετι εκ σου εις τον αιωνα υδεις καρπον φαγοι. And Jeſus anſwering

 ſaid

(a) John i. 42. (b) Matt. iv. 10. (c) Luke i. 15.
(d) Rev. xix. 1. (e) Rom. ix. 29. (f) Rev. ix. 11.
(g) Matt. i. 1. (h) Gen. v. 1. (i) Mark xvi. 2.
(k) ver. 9. (l) 1 Cor. xvi. 2. (m) Luke i. 37.

ſaid to the fig-tree, &c (*a*).—Εξομολογειν ſtrictly means, to confeſs; but in the New Teſtament, to thank or praiſe; which is evidently a tranſlation of the hebrew word הודה hodhah, in Hiphil, from ידה jadhah; and at that time Jeſus anſwered and ſaid, Εξομολογουμαι σοι, πατερ, κυριε του ουρανου και της γης, οτι απεκρυψας ταυτα, &c. —Περαν ſignifies, trans; as beyond, or on the other ſide of a river; but in the New Teſtament it is uſed for "near to" without determining on which ſide. Thus we read of the land of Zabulon, and the land of Naphthali, by the way of the ſea, περαν του Ιορδανου, Galilee, of the Gentiles (*b*), that is near or about Jordan; for neither Zebulon, nor Naphthali, nor Galilee of the Gentiles were beyond, (as our tranſlators have expreſſed it,) but near Jordan. Περαν, then, is a tranſlation of עבר gnebher, which ſignifies "near to," on either ſide as well as "beyond." Thus Moſes is ſaid to have ſtood בעבר הירדן bengnebher hajjarden (*c*); that is, near Jordan, for he never went over it into Canaan (*d*). There are

3dly, Some words new coined, to tranſlate hebrew words by; as αναθεματιζω, for חרם charam; ο δε ηρξατο αναθεματιζειν και ομνυειν· οτι ουκ οιδα τον ανθρωπον, &c (*e*).—Σπλαγχνιζομαι, a word formed to tranſlate רחם racham, intimè dilexit: ο δε Ιησους—ειπε, σπλαγχνιζομαι επι τον οχλον, οτι ηδη ημεραι τρεις προσμενουσι μοι, και ουκ εχουσι τι φαγωσι (*f*).—Χαριτοω, to tranſlate חנן chanan, gratioſus fuit: Ο αγγελος προς αυτην ειπε, Χαιρε, κεχαριτωμενη (*g*).

Secondly, Hebraiſms in phraſes are either

1ſt,

(*a*) Mark xi. 14. (*b*) Matt. iv. 15. (*c*) Deut. i. 1. (*d*) Deut. xxxii. 52. (*e*) Mark xiv. 71. (*f*) Matt. xv. 32. (*g*) Luke i. 28.

1ſt, Such as have not been uſed by other greek authors; as, ſeeing of life and death for living and dying: Πιστει Ενωχ μετετεθη του μη ιδειν θανατον (*a*) In like manner the Hebrew, ולא יראה־מות velo jireh-maveth (*b*). Again, εξεληλυθοτας εκ της οσφυος Αβρααμ is analogous to the following expreſſion, "all the ſouls that came with Jacob into Egypt, יצאי ירכו jotſe jerecho, who came out of his loins, &c (*c*)." Or

2dly, Such as have not been uſed by other greek writers in the ſame ſenſe as in the New Teſtament; as, to hear the voice of a perſon ſignifies, to obey: Πας ο ων εκ της αληθειας, ακουει μου της φωνης (*d*), parallel with כי שמעת לקול ישתך chi ſhemangta lekol iſhteka (*e*).— To eat bread ſignifies to ſit down to a meal; Ου γαρ νιπτονται τας χειρας αυτων, οταν αρτον εσθιωσιν (*f*), which is an expreſſion parallel to this, "And they made ready the preſent againſt Joſeph came at noon; for they heard, כי שם יאכלו לחם chi ſham jochelu lachem, that they ſhould eat bread there (*g*)."

There are alſo Pleonaſms in the Greek Teſtament; ſuch as do not occur in other greek authors. As, Επαρας ουν ο Ιησους τους οφθαλμους και θεασαμενος οτι πολυς, &c. "when Jeſus then lift up his eyes and ſaw a great company, &c (*h*)." parallel to this in the Hebrew, וישא אברהם את־עיניו וירא vajjiſſa Abraham eth-gneinaiv vajjare; and Abraham lift up his eyes and ſaw the place, &c (*i*). Again, Ομοθυμαδον ηραν φωνην προς τον Θεον, και ειπον, "they lift up their voice

(*a*) Heb. xi. 5. (*b*) Pſal. lxxxix. 49. heb. 48. engl. (*c*) Gen. xlvi. 25. heb. 26. engl. (*d*) John xviii. 37. (*e*) Gen. iii. 17. (*f*) Matt xv. 2. (*g*) Gen. xliii. 24. heb. 25. engl. (*h*) John vi. 5. (*i*) Gen. xxii. 4.

to God with one accord, and ſaid (*a*): like the following in the Hebrew, "And when they told it to Jotham, he went and ſtood in the top of mount Gerizim, and lift up his voice, and cried and ſaid unto them, וישא קולו ויקרא ויאמר vajjiſſa kolo vajjikra vajjomer (*b*)." Again, Εκτεινας την χειρα ηψατο αυτε ο Ιησες, "Jeſus put forth his hand and touched him, &c (*c*)." Like that expreſſion concerning Noah, וישלח ידו ויקחה ויבא vajjiſhlach jadho vajjakkacheha vajjabhee; "and he put forth his hand, and took her (the dove,) and pulled her in unto him into the ark (*d*).

Thirdly, There are conſtructions in the New Teſtament, which are ſaid to be hebraiſms: As,

1ſt, The feminine gender for the neuter: Λιθον ον απεδοκιμασαν οι οικοδομουντες, αυτος εγενηθη εις κεφαλην γωνιας· παρα Κυριε εγενετο αυτη, και εστι θαυμαστη, &c (*e*). היתה לראש פנה מאת יהוה היתה זאת היא נפלאת hajethah leroſh pinnah, mèèth Jehovah hajethah zoth hi niphlath, &c (*f*). In like manner, אחת שאלתי מאת־יהוה אותה אבקש achath ſhaalti mèeth Jehovah othah abakkeſh (*g*). Some, indeed, make κεφαλην to be the antecedent to αυτη (פנה pinnah to היא hi), and not the whole proceding ſentence; and they render the clauſe, παρα Κυριε εγενετο αυτη, à Domino conſtitutus eſt ille angularis; agreeable to the ſenſe of εγενετο in this paſſage, Το σαββατον δια τον ανθρωπον εγενετο (*h*).

2dly, A noun repeated twice, to expreſs a diſtribution into ſeveral parts; as "He commanded them all to ſit down, συμποσια συμποσια, by

(*a*) Acts iv. 24. (*b*) Judg. ix. 7. (*c*) Matt. viii. 3. (*d*) Gen. viii. 9. (*e*) Matt. xxi. 42. (*f*) Pſal. cxviii. 23. (*g*) Pſal. xxvii. 4. (*h*) Mark ii. 27.

by companies,—and they ſat, πρασιαι πρασιαι, in ranks (*a*):" like this hebrew expreſſion, "He delivered them into the hands of his ſervants, ערך ערך gnèther gnèther, every drove, by themſelves (*b*). Again, "He called unto him the twelve, and began to ſend them forth, δυο δυο, by two and two (*c*);" like the following hebrew phraſe, "of every clean beaſt thou ſhalt take to thee, שבעה שבעה ſhibhngnah ſhibhngnah, by ſevens (*d*)." The regular expreſſion is ανα δυο, as it is in the parallel place (*e*).

3dly, The ſuperlative degree expreſſed by the addition of θεος: "In which time Moſes was born, and was ασειος τω θεω, exceeding fair (*f*). Thus, in Hebrew, it is ſaid, "Ninevah was, עיר־גדולה לאלהים gnir gadholah Lelohim, an exceeding great city (*g*)."

4thly, Some verbs are ſaid to be uſed with different conſtructions from what they are in other greek authors; as, προσκυνεω with a dative caſe: λεπρος ελθων προσεκυνει αυτω (*h*). Again, και προσεκυνησαν αυτω (*i*); whereas in other authors it governs an accuſative.—So alſo ειναι εις τι, for ειναι τι, is ſaid to be an Hebraiſm: "For this cauſe ſhall a man leave father and mother, and cleave to his wife, και εσονται οι δυο εις σαρκα μιαν (*k*)." "Unto them who be diſobedient, the ſtone which the builders diſallowed, ουτος εγενηθη εις κεφαλην γωνιας (*l*). Thus in Hebrew, "God is the Lord, and he hath enlightened us," ויאר לנו vajjaer lanu (*m*)."

(*a*) Mark vi. 39, 40. (*b*) Gen. xxxii. 16.
(*c*) Mark vi. 7. (*d*) Gen. vii. 2. (*e*) Luke x. 1.
(*f*) Acts vii 20. (*g*) Jonah iii. 3. (*h*) Matt. viii. 2.
(*i*) John ix. 38. (*k*) Matt. xix. 5. (*l*) 1 Pet. ii. 7.
(*m*) Pſal. cxviii. 27.

Fourthly, There are hebrew figures obſerved in the New Teſtament; as

1ſt, Enallage of the caſe, perſon, number, and gender.——Enallage of the caſe, ὁ νικων, δωσω αυτω, &c (a).—ὁ νικων, ποιησω αυτον (b).—Ελαλησε προς τους πατερας ημων, τω Αβρααμ, και τω σπερματι αυτου (c).—Παν χρημα ρηγον, αποδωσουσι περι αυτου λογον (d).—Λιθον, ον απεδοκιμασαν, ουτος εγενηθη, &c (e).—Ο γαρ Μωσης ουτος—ουκ οιδαμεν τι γεγονεν αυτω (f). See the like kind of expreſſion in the Hebrew, האל תמים דרכו, Hael, tamim darco (g).

Enallage of the perſon: "O Jeruſalem, Jeruſalem, thou that killeſt the prophets, and ſtoneſt them that are ſent προς αυτην, how often would I have gathered τα τεκνα σου (h)." Thus in the Hebrew, "I was wroth with my people, קצפתי על־עמי katſaphti gnal gnammi, &c. thou didſt ſhow them no mercy, לא שמת להם lo-ſamt lahem rachamim רחמים (i)."

Enallage of number: "At that times Jeſus went τοις σαββασι δια των σποριμων (k). And

Of gender: "Not holding την κεφαλην, εξ ου the whole body by joints and bands, &c (l).

2dly, Pleonaſms are ſaid to be borrowed from the Hebrew. I have mentioned ſome already, and ſhall add the following: "That the reſidue of men might ſeek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles εφ' ους επικεκληται το ονομα μου επ' αυτους (m)." Thus in the Hebrew, "Every place," אשר תדרך כף־רגלכם בו aſher tidhrok caph-raglechem bo (n). Again, "To the woman

(a) Rev. ii. 26. (b) chap. iii. 12. (c) Luke i. 55. (d) Matt. xii. 36. (e) chap. xxi. 42. (f) Acts vii. 40. (g) Pſal. xviii. 30. (h) Matt. xxiii. 37. (i) Iſa. xlvii. 6. (k) Matt. 12. 1. (l) Col. ii. 19. (m) Acts xv. 17. (n) Joſh. i. 3.

man were given two wings of a great eagle, that ſhe might fly into the wilderneſs, into her place, οπυ τρεφεται εκει (a). Similar to this inſtance, in the Hebrew, "Then ſaid Saul to his ſervant, Well ſaid, come let us go; ſo they went unto the city אשר־שם איש האלהים aſher-ſham iſh Haelohim (b). Again, Pilate---ſaid Αθωος ειμι απο τυ αιματος, &c (c). and St. Paul, ὁτι καθαρος ἐγω απο τυ αιματος παντων (d): where απο ſeems to be redundant. The following is a ſimilar hebrew expreſſion, "When David heard it he ſaid, נקי אנכי---מדמי אבנר naki anchi---middeme Abnèr (e)."

3dly, Ellipſis is a common figure in the New Teſtament, after the manner of the Hebrew: For inſtance, "Behold, I ſend unto you prophets and wiſemen and ſcribes, Και ἐξ αυτων αποκτενειτε και σταυρωσετε, και ἐξ αυτων μαστιγωσετε, &c (f). Like the following expreſſion in the ſecond book of Kings; "And John went---into the houſe of Baal, and ſaid unto the worſhippers of Baal, ſearch and look, leſt there be here with you מעבדי יהוה mèngnabhdhè Jehovah (g).

However, after all the exceptions to the purity of the New Teſtament Greek, it hath as able critics among its advocates, as any that have appeared on the contrary ſide; particularly Mr. Blackwall, who, in his ſacred claſſics, maintains the language of the New Teſtament to be not only pure, but very elegant Greek. He hath vindicated, with great learning, the ſeveral paſſages excepted againſt, producing parallel ones out of the pureſt authors. He denies

(a) Rev. xii. 14. (b) 1 Sam. ix. 10. (c) Matt. xxvii. 24. (d) Acts xx. 26. (e) 2 Sam. iii. 28. (f) Matt. xxiii. 34. (g) 2 Kings x. 23.

nies there are any ſoleciſms; having not only well ſupported the ſuſpected places, but generally ſhown a peculiar beauty in them. It is a remark of Mr. Addiſon, that the moſt exquiſite words and fineſt ſtrokes of an author are thoſe, which often appear the moſt doubtful and exceptionable, to a man who wants a reliſh for polite learning; and which a ſour undiſtinguiſhing critick attacks with the greateſt violence. Tully obſerves, that it is very eaſy to brand, or fix a mark, upon what he calls "verbum ardens," a bold glowing expreſſion, and to turn it into ridicule by a cold ill-natured criticiſm. Blackwall acknowledges, the New Teſtament hath words and expreſſions not to be found in any claſſic author; nor could it be otherwiſe, when it treats of things which the Heathens had no ideas of, nor any words for. New names muſt be given to new things. In this reſpect no other liberty is taken, than is freely done by Tully, Plato, and the greateſt geniuſes of all ages.

As for the mixture of foreign words, eſpecially latin, there are not many. However, in the uſe of theſe few, the ſacred writers are equally to be vindicated, at leaſt, with the greek claſſics, who have many foreign, particularly perſic words. For, as the moſt eminent of them flouriſhed at a time, when the empire of the Perſians was of vaſt extent, and had a great influence on the affairs of Greece, many of their words became familiar to, and were adopted by the Greeks. In the times of the apoſtles and evangeliſts, the roman empire having extended its conqueſt over all the countries where Greek was ſpoke, by that means roman

words

words and phraſes crept in as before perſic had done.

As to Hebraiſms, the reaſon why the New Teſtament writers mingled them with their Greek, does not ſeem to be owing ſo much to their being Hebrews, as to their diſcourſing of many things relating to the moſaic law, and capable of being well expreſſed in the hebrew language, which could not be expreſſed ſo happily, if at all, in any other. So that if they had declined uſing the hebrew idiom, they muſt have invented new words and phraſes, which would not have been eaſily, or ſoon, underſtood. Mr. Blackwall obſerves, that in common morals, in matters of converſation and hiſtorical narrative, they uſe the ſame words and phraſes with Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, &c. and that they do not more differ from the claſſics in their form of expreſſion, than theſe do from one another.

A great many expreſſions, originally Hebraiſms, have, by the beſt authors, been tranſplanted into the greek tongue, and are now become proper and genuine phraſes. But the ſacred writers, being better acquainted, with the hebrew language, have remarkably enriched their ſtile from that inexhauſtible mine, to which the Greeks had little acceſs.

Upon the whole, he is confident, that if a man reads the New Teſtament with a heart as much prepoſſeſſed in its favour, as when he ſits down to Virgil or Homer, he will find incidents and ſentiments therein, expreſſed with more natural propriety and energy than can be found in their writings, though in every age ſince they wrote, they have been the objects of univerſal admiration.

I am

I am loath to diſmiſs the ſubject we are upon, without giving you an abſtract of this author's critique upon the ſeveral writers of the New Teſtament *.

St. Matthew, ſaith he, hath all the characters of a good hiſtorian; truth and impartiality, clearneſs of narration, propriety and gravity of diction, and order of time well obſerved. The two next evangeliſts often borrow his very words and form of expreſſion, when they are on the ſame ſubject; and yet each has his proper ſtyle.

St. Mark has a comprehenſive, clear and beautiful brevity. He ſometimes uſes the repetition of words of the ſame original, and like ſound; as the moſt vigorous authors do: ſuch as, απεσιγασαν την σιγην (a). — εν τη αναστασει οταν αναστωσι (b). — κτισεως, ης εκτισεν (c).

St. Luke's ſtyle is pure, copious, and flowing. He acquaints us with numerous hiſtorical paſſages, not related by the other evangeliſts. He is juſtly applauded for his politeneſs and elegance by ſome critics; who ſeem, however, to magnify him, in order to depreciate his brethren; notwithſtanding he hath as many hebraiſms and peculiarities as any of them.

The ſtyle of St. John is grave and ſimple, ſhort and conſpicuous, always plain, and ſometimes low; but he reacheth to the heavens in the ſublimity of his notions. He has frequent repetitions, in order to preſs his important doctrines with more cloſeneſs and vehemence. He often takes one thing two ways, both in the affirmative

* See vol. 1. part 2. chap. vii.

(a) Mark ii. 4. (b) chap. xii. 25. (c) chap. xiii. 19.

affirmative and negative: as, "He that hath the ſon, hath life; but he that hath not the ſon, hath not life."

St. Paul is admired for the copiouſneſs and variety of his ſtyle, for the loftineſs of his ſentiment, for the dexterity of his addreſs. He has every charm of eloquence, and ſhows himſelf, occaſionally, maſter of every ſtyle. "If any, ſaith Mr. Locke, hath thought St. Paul a looſe writer, it was only becauſe he was a looſe reader, for he that takes notice of his deſign, will find there is ſcarce a word or expreſſion, he makes uſe of, except with relation and tendency to his preſent main purpoſe."

Eraſmus paſſes a bold cenſure upon St. James, when he ſaith, "The epiſtle under his name does not every where expreſs the apoſtolical gravity and majeſty *." But other learned and judicious perſons have imagined they have diſcovered, in that epiſtle, vigorous and expreſſive words, a beautiful ſimplicity, natural and engaging ſentiments, lively figures and ſubſtantial eloquence. Where can a finer deſcription of the malignity and miſchief of an unbridled tongue be found, than in his third chapter. The emphaſis and eloquence of that ſublime deſcription of the divine munificence and immutability in the ſeventeenth verſe of the firſt chapter, is greatly and juſtly admired †.

St.

* Vid. annot. in cap. v. ſub fine.

† The firſt words of that paſſage are a fine Hexameter,

Πασα δοσις αγαθη, και παν δωρημα τελειον

A ſmall tranſpoſition of the next words will make another Hexameter,

Εξ' ανω των φωτων πατερος καταβαινον ανωθεν.

How naturally do ſublime ſentiments give birth to poetical numbers, as well as poetical expreſſions!

St. Peter's ſtyle expreſſes the noble vehemence and fervor of his ſpirit. He writes with that quickneſs and rapidity, ſometimes neglecting the formal niceties of grammar, (as is common with ſublime geniuſes,) that you can ſcarcely perceive the pauſes of his diſcourſe, and the diſtinction of his periods. His deſcription of the conflagration and future judgment (*a*) is a maſter-piece. He makes us ſee, as it were, the heavens and the earth wrapt up in devouring flames; and hear the groans of an expiring world, and the cruſh of nature tumbling into univerſal ruin. And how ſolemn and moving is the epiphonema, or practical inference, "Seeing therefore, all theſe things muſt be diſſolved, what manner of perſons ought ye to be in all holy converſation and godlineſs (*b*)."

Origen ſaith, that "Jude hath wrote an epiſtle, of few verſes, indeed, but full of vigorous expreſſions of heavenly grace *." This apoſtle adopts the ſentiment, and frequently the words of St. Peter in the ſecond chapter of his ſecond epiſtle; though ſometimes he leaves out ſome of his words, at other times he enlarges, and gives a different turn to the thought. Theſe two writers are very near a-kin, in ſubject, ſtyle, vehemence and juſt indignation againſt impudence, lewdneſs, and debauchers of ſound principles. They anſwer one another in the New Teſtament, as the prophecy of Obadiah and part of the forty-ninth of Jeremiah do in the old.

After

(*a*) 2 Pet. iii. (*b*) ver. 11.

* Comment. in Matt. xii. 55. p. 223. D. edit. Huet. Colon. 1685.

After Mr. Blackwall hath fully vindicated the writers of the New Teſtament, and ſet them, at leaſt, upon a level with the beſt claſſics, he ſhows in the laſt chapter, what advantages they have over them in various reſpects. The greater part of the ſecond volume is a critique upon the verſions, and various lections of the New Teſtament; which it is beſide our preſent purpoſe to conſider.

We return now from this digreſſion to the ſubject of jewiſh antiquities.

The genealogies of the Hebrews.

Godwin obſerves, that "the whole body of Iſrael, or the Hebrew nation was divided into twelve tribes, and that publick records were kept, wherein every one's genealogy was regiſtered, to manifeſt to what particular tribe he belonged." This appears from the following paſſage in Chronicles, "The acts of Rehoboam,—are they not written in the book of Shemaiah the prophet, and of Iddo the ſeer, concerning genealogies (*a*); לְהִתְיַחֵשׂ lehithjaches, in genealogizando; that is probably in their genealogical tables of the royal families of the houſe of David; in which alſo, it ſeems, was interſperſed ſome account of the lives and actions of the kings; the acts of Rehoboam being not only written in this book, but likewiſe the "acts of his ſon Abijah, his ways and his ſayings (*b*)." In the fifth chapter of the firſt book of Chronicles, after an abſtract of the genealogies

(*a*) 2 Chron. xii. 15. (*b*) 2 Chron. xiii. 22.

genealogies contained in the book of Geneſis, and of ſome of the tribes of Iſrael to the time of the captivity, it is added, "all theſe were reckoned by genealogies in the days of Jotham king of Judah, and in the days of Jeroboam king of Iſrael (*a*); that is, the genealogical tables were then drawn up, which afterwards were continued down to the captivity; the names of ſeveral perſons being inſerted, who did not live till after the days of Jotham and Jeroboam. And then, after a genealogical table of the other tribes in the three next chapters, it follows, "So all Iſrael were reckoned by genealogies; and behold, they were written in the book of the kings of Iſrael and Judah (*b*)." Where by "the book of the kings" cannot be meant thoſe two hiſtorical books, which now paſs under that name, theſe genealogies not being written therein; but ſome authentic public records of their genealogies, called "the king's book," probably, as being under his cuſtody: Of which it is not unlikely there was a duplicate, one copy kept by the king of Judah, the other by the king of Iſrael; for it is called "the book of the kings of Iſrael and Judah."

The ſtory of Herod's deſtroying the records, of the genealogies, which Godwin mentions, is related by Euſebius in his eccleſiaſtical hiſtory *. Yet it does not ſeem, that the Jews loſt all account of their genealogies from that time; for they continued their diſtinction of tribes long after. St. Paul ſays, he was of "the tribe of Benjamin (*c*). St. James writes to the "twelve tribes, that were ſcattered abroad (*d*)." And,

(*a*) 1 Chron. v. 17. (*b*) chap. ix. 1.
* Lib. 1. cap. 7. p. 24. edit. Reading, Cantab. 1720.
(*c*) Phil. iii. 5. (*d*) James i. 1.

And, later ſtill, Joſephus gives the genealogy of his own family in his life, and ſays, "I give you this ſucceſſion of our family, as I find it written in the public tables *." And he adds, that "all their prieſts were obliged to prove their ſucceſſion from an ancient line;" and if they could not do it, they were to be excluded from officiating as prieſts. From whence it appears, there were public genealogical tables of their tribes and families as late as Joſephus, who lived at the deſtruction of Jeruſalem. By the way, therefore, it may be reaſonably preſumed, that both St. Matthew and St. Luke copied their genealogies of Chriſt, the one of the line of Mary, the other of Joſeph, out of the public records, which were deemed authentic vouchers. The apoſtle, accordingly, repreſents it as a thing evident to the Jews, that "our Lord ſprung out of Judah (*a*)." It was ſo, by their own genealogical tables, which the ſacred hiſtorians faithfully copied. If there were any errors in thoſe tables, they were not accountable for them; their buſineſs was only to tranſcribe without alteration; tampering with them might have created ſuſpicion, and given the Jews ſome colour for denying, that our Lord "ſprung out of Judah," according to the ancient prophecies concerning the Meſſiah.

Upon the whole, we muſt either conclude, that Euſebius had been entirely miſinformed concerning Herod's burning the genealogical records; or that if one copy, (perhaps that which was laid up in the archives of the tem-

* Joſep. in vitâ §. 1. ad fin. apud oper. tom. 2. p. 1. edit. Haverc.

(*a*) Heb. vi. 14.

ple,) was deſtroyed, there were others in private hands, from whence another public copy was afterwards tranſcribed, and depoſited in the ſame place.

It is probable, that after the diſperſion of the Jews upon the diſſolution of their polity, the genealogical tables came to be neglected, and ſo gradually periſhed. Some imagine, that their frequent intermarriages with the people of the countries, into which they were diſperſed, made them deſignedly diſcontinue them; that the corrupt mixture and debaſement of their blood might not appear. However that be, it is certain they have long ſince been loſt.

From hence an argument is formed by Chriſtians, that the Meſſiah muſt be already come; ſince if he be not, it can never be proved, that he is of the tribe of Judah and family of David.

But to this the Jews reply, that either Elias, or ſome other inſpired prieſt or prophet, ſhall come, and reſtore their genealogical tables before the Meſſiah's appearance. A tradition, which they ground on a paſſage in Nehemiah(*a*), to this effect: The genealogical regiſter of the families of certain prieſts being loſt, they were not able to make out their lineal deſcent from Aaron; and therefore, "as polluted, were put from the prieſthood;" the "Tirſhatha ſaid unto them, that they ſhould not eat of the moſt holy things, till there ſtood up a prieſt in Urim and Thummim." From hence the Jews conclude, that ſuch a prieſt will ſtand up, and reſtore and compleat the genealogies of their families: though others ſuppoſe theſe words to import,

(*a*) chap. vii. 64, 65.

import, that they ſhould never exerciſe their prieſthood any more; and that, "till there ſhall ſtand up a prieſt in Urim and Thummim," amounts to the ſame as the roman proverb, ad græcas calendas, ſince the Urim and Thummim were now abſolutely and for ever loſt.

The Proſelytes.

We now come to the Proſelytes; who were not of the natural poſterity of Abraham, but joined themſelves to the people of Iſrael, and were, by the Greeks, ſtiled προσηλυτοι, απο τε προσεληλυθεναι, ab adventando & coeundo *; but by the Hebrews גרים gèrim, peregrini, foreigners or inmates in oppoſition to natives. Hence the ſon of a Proſelyte by the father's ſide, was called בן גר ben ger, the ſon of a Proſelyte by the mother's ſide, בן גרה ben gerah, and the ſon of both a he and ſhe proſelyte by the artificial name בגבג bagbag, which is compoſed of the initial letters of ben ger, and ben gerah.

The Hebrews ſpeak of two ſorts of Proſelytes, the one called גרי צדק gere tſedhek, proſelyti juſtitiæ; the other תושבים toſhabhim, inquilini, or גרי שער gere ſhangnar, proſelyti portæ. The former became compleat Jews, and were in all reſpects united to the jewiſh church and nation; the latter did not embrace the jewiſh religion, yet were ſuffered to live among the Jews under certain reſtrictions. Nevertheleſs the former, as well as the latter,

* Philo. Jud. lib 1. de monarch. apud opera, p. 631. edit. Colon. Allobr. 1613.

are ſometimes diſtinguiſhed from Jews, that is, from native Jews. Thus in the Acts (*a*), we read of the Jews, and religious Proſelytes, at Antioch in Piſidia; who muſt have been Proſelytes of righteouſneſs, becauſe none were called Proſelytes of the gate, (if any ſuch there were,) who did not dwell in the land of Iſrael.

As for the Proſelytes of righteouſneſs, the ſcripture gives us no other account of the manner of their admiſſion into the jewiſh church, but by the rite of circumciſion. In the book of Exodus, amongſt the regulations concerning the paſſover, this is one, "When a ſtranger will ſojourn with thee, and will keep the paſſover to the Lord, let all his males be circumciſed, and then let him come near and keep it; and he ſhall be as one, that is born in the land (*b*)." Where theſe two things are further obſervable,

1ſt, That when a man thus became a Proſelyte, all his males were to be circumciſed as well as himſelf; whereby his children were admitted into the viſible church of God, in his right, as their father.

2dly, That upon this he ſhould be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of the jewiſh church and nation, as well as be ſubject to the whole law: He ſhould be as one "born in the land."

To this brief account which the ſcripture gives us of the admiſſion of Proſelytes, the rabbies add a much larger one, of the preparation for their admiſſion, of the form of their admiſſion, and of the conſequences and effects of it.

Firſt,

(*a*) chap. xiii. 43. (*b*) Exod. xii. 48.

Firſt, The preparation for the admiſſion of Proſelytes conſiſted, according to them, of three articles:

1ſt, An examination:

2dly, Inſtruction:

3dly, Their making a profeſſion of their faith, and of their obedience to the jewiſh law.

1ſt, The perſon, that offered himſelf to be a Proſelyte, was examined by three of the magiſtrates concerning the cauſes that moved him to it; whether it was the love of any jewiſh woman, the fear of any temporal puniſhment, the proſpect of riches, or of any worldly advantage? or whether it was a ſincere love to God and his law? When he had given a ſatisfactory anſwer to theſe queſtions, he was then

2dly, Inſtructed in the jewiſh religion, and particularly in the doctrine of rewards and puniſhments. And after this

3dly, He ſolemnly profeſſed his aſſent to the doctrines which had been propoſed to him, and promiſed to perſevere in the faith, and practice of the law of God till death.

Secondly, As to the form and manner of admitting Proſelytes, the rabbies make it to conſiſt of three articles, circumciſion, baptiſm and ſacrifice.

1ſt, To the ſcripture account of the requirement of circumciſion, in this caſe, they add, that though the Proſelyte was a Samaritan, or of any other nation, who uſed that rite, ſome blood muſt, nevertheleſs, be drawn afreſh from the part which had been circumciſed.

2dly, The Proſelyte, whether male or female, muſt be baptized by the immerſion of the whole body into water; and this muſt be

performed in a river, fountain, or pond, not in a veſſel.

Some ground this Proſelyte baptiſm on the inſtruction which Jacob gave to his "houſhold and all that were with him," when they were to make a new conſecration of themſelves to God, "Put away the ſtrange gods from amongſt you, and be clean (*a*)." Where by "being clean" they underſtand their being baptiſed, or their bodies being waſhed with water. They further ſuppoſe, that the Iſraelites "being baptiſed into Moſes in the cloud and in the ſea," mentioned by St. Paul (*b*), means their entering into the moſaic covenant, by the rite of baptiſm; and that when, therefore, in after ages any became Proſelytes, or entered into this covenant, they alſo were baptiſed.

Godwin ſeems to think, John's baptiſm was of this ſort. But it is certain, that could not properly be proſelyte baptiſm; becauſe he adminiſtered it to ſuch as were Jews already, and he had no commiſſion to ſet up a new diſpenſation, to which people ſhould be admitted by this or any other rite. He only gave notice that the kingdom of God, or the goſpel diſpenſation, was at hand; but it did not commence till after his death, namely at our Saviour's reſurrection: And proſelyte baptiſm was a form of profeſſing a new religion, at leaſt new to the perſon profeſſing it, and of his being admitted a member of a church of which he was not one before. It was therefore, I ſay, of a very different nature from John's baptiſm. His is rather to be conſidered as one of thoſe "divers waſhings," in uſe among the Jews on many

(*a*) Gen. xxxv. 2. (*b*) 1 Cor. x. 2.

many occaſions; for he did not attempt to make any alteration in the jewiſh religion as ſettled by the moſaic law, any more than to erect a new diſpenſation. And as theſe waſhings were intended not only for "the purifying of the fleſh," but to be ſigns and ſymbols of moral purity; ſo the rite of baptiſm was, in this view, very ſuitable to the doctrine of repentance, which John preached.

It is a further ſuppoſition of Godwin's, that our Saviour converted this jewiſh proſelyte baptiſm into a chriſtian ſacrament. Upon this notion Dr. Wall * hath founded an argument for baptiſing children, as well as adult perſons; becauſe when a parent was proſelyted, all his children were baptiſed, as well as all his male children circumciſed. But as baptiſm was adminiſtered, according to the jewiſh doctors, only to the children born before his proſelytiſm, not to any born afterwards, nor to his more diſtant poſterity, who were eſteemed holy branches in virtue of ſpringing from an holy root †; ſome infer, that under the chriſtian diſpenſation baptiſm is only to be adminiſtered to converts from judaiſm, mahometaniſm, paganiſm, or ſome other religion, and to their deſcendants born before their converſion and baptiſm, but to none born after. Mr. Emlyn, in particular ‡, inſiſts upon this argument againſt the

* See the introduction to his hiſtory of infant baptiſm.

† It was a maxim with the rabbies, Natus baptizati habetur pro baptizato. This reſtriction of baptiſm to children born before their parent's proſelytiſm reſts on the ſame authority, as the cuſtom of baptizing any children of proſelytes; which appears from Dr. Wall.

‡ Previous queſtion to ſeveral queſtions about valid and invalid baptiſm.

conſtant and univerſal obligation of infant baptiſm.

But after all, it remains to be proved, not only that chriſtian baptiſm was inſtituted in the room of proſelyte baptiſm, but that the Jews had any ſuch baptiſm in our Saviour's time. The earlieſt accounts we have of it are in the Miſhna and Gemara *; the former compiled, as the Jews aſſert, by rabbi Juda, in the ſecond century, though learned men in general bring it ſeveral centuries lower; the latter, not till the ſeventh century. There is not a word of it in Philo; nor yet in Joſephus, though he gives an account of the proſelyting of the Idumeans by Hyrcanus. Indeed on this occaſion, he mentions only circumciſion as the rite of initiation, and ſaith, that upon receiving this rite, and living according to the jewiſh law, they from that time became Jews †. And notwithſtanding he ſpeaks of John's baptiſm, yet it is under a very different notion from the proſelyte baptiſm ſpoken of by the miſhnical rabbies. "This good man, ſaith he, did Herod kill, who exhorted the virtuous, juſt and pious

* The Miſhna is a collection of the jewiſh traditions and explanations of ſeveral paſſages of ſcripture. The Gemara is a ſort of gloſſary on the Miſhna. And theſe together make up the Talmud. There are two Gemaras, that of Jeruſalem, and that of Babylon; the latter of which is moſt valued. The Jeruſalem Gemara, father Morin proves from the work itſelf, in which mention is made of the Turks, could not have been wrote till the time of Heraclius, about the year 620. The Gemara of Babylon was begun by one Aſa, in the beginning of the ſeventh century, and on account of the wars between the Saracens and Perſians diſcontinued for ſeventy-three years, and then finiſhed by one Joſa.

† Antiq. lib. xiii. cap. ix. §. 1. tom. 1. p. 659. edit. Haverc.

ous to come to his baptiſm; for he looked upon baptiſm to be acceptable to God, when uſed, not for purging away certain offences, but for purifying the body, the ſoul having been before cleanſed by righteouſneſs *." So that he makes John's baptiſm to be of the nature of the jewiſh purifications, or ceremonial waſhings, without having any reference to proſelyte baptiſm; which, on this occaſion, he could hardly have failed mentioning, if it had been then in uſe.

It is alledged, however, in favour of its antiquity, that it is mentioned by Arrian, who lived A. D. 150. for ſpeaking of a philoſopher's obligation to act agreeably to his character, he hath this illuſtration: "If we ſee any one change his profeſſion," (or become a Jew,) "we do not for that reaſon ſtile him a Jew, but regard him as an hypocrite. Yet when he diſcovers the diſpoſition and manners of one who is baptized, τὸν βεβαμμένον, and inliſted in that ſect, then he both is, and is called, a Jew †."

But to this it is replied, that nothing was more common, than for the Heathens to confound the Jews and Chriſtians. Even Feſtus, who governed for ſome time in Judea, ſeems to have taken the Chriſtians only for a ſect of the Jews (*a*). Suetonius ſpeaks of an inſurrection made by the Jews, "impulſore Chreſto ‡." And

* Antiq. lib. xviii. cap. 5. §. 2. tom. 1. p. 883, 884. edit. Haverc.

† Comment. in Epictet. lib. 2. cap. 9. p. 192. edit. Cantab. 1655.

(*a*) Acts xxv. 19, 20.

‡ Sueton. in vit. Claudii, cap. xxv. §. 12. & annot. in loc. tom. 2. p. 87. edit. Pitiſci.

And it is moſt likely, that Arrian meant Chriſtians in the place alledged, becauſe in his time many perſons became Proſelytes to chriſtianity, but few or none to judaiſm, the Jews who were ſcattered amongſt all nations, being every where oppreſſed and deſpiſed. Beſides, if he had ſpoke of Proſelytes to judaiſm, it is highly probable he would have mentioned their circumciſion, for which the Heathens derided them, rather then their baptiſm, which was not ſo very foreign to ſome of the heathen rites of purification.

Upon the whole, it is more likely the Jews took the hint of proſelyte baptiſm from the Chriſtians, after our Saviour's time, than that he borrowed his baptiſm from theirs; which, whenever it came into practice, was one of thoſe additions to the law of God, which he ſeverely cenſures (*a*). To this it is probable, Juſtin Martyr refers, in his dialogue with Trypho, when among the jewiſh hereſies or ſects, he mentions that of the βαπτισαι baptizers *. From hence it ſhould ſeem that in his time, about the middle of the ſecond century, proſelyte baptiſm was a novel practice, and had not yet univerſally prevailed.

However, that be, there wants more evidence of its being as ancient as our Saviour's time, than I apprehend can be produced, to ground any argument upon it in relation to chriſtian baptiſm. We therefore diſmiſs this form of the admiſſion of Proſelytes, as uncertain †.

3dly,

(*a*) Matt. xv. 9.

* Apud opera, p. 307. A. edit. Paris. 1615.

† On the ſubject of proſelyte baptiſm, ſee Lightfoot. hor. heb. ad Matt. iii. 6. and harm. ad Joh. iii. 23. Selden.

3dly, The rabbies tell us, the Proſelyte was to offer a ſacrifice on occaſion of his admiſſion; in the preſence of three witneſſes, not mean, but reſpectable and honourable perſons.

Thus much concerning the form and manner of admitting Proſelytes.

Thirdly, We are to conſider the effects and conſequences of being made a Proſelyte.

1ſt, The Proſelyte was now conſidered as born again. It was a ſaying among the Jews, that "when a man is made a Proſelyte he is like a new born infant," and "he hath a new ſoul." This is ſuppoſed to throw ſome light on our Saviour's reproof to Nicodemus, "Art thou a maſter in Iſrael and knoweſt not theſe things (*a*)," that is, what being "born again" means? For, it ſeems, Nicodemus, apprehending a Jew was never to be a Proſelyte to any other religion, did not know how to underſtand it otherwiſe, than of "entring a ſecond time into the womb, and being born (*b*)." Whereas he who was a maſter in Iſrael, and probably a member of the great council or Sanhedrim, might have been expected to comprehend the force of our Lord's phraſeology from the common uſe of the like expreſſions concerning thoſe who became Proſelytes *.

2dly, The bond of natural relation, betwixt the Proſelyte and all his kindred, was now diſſolved. Wherefore it was a maxim with the rabbies, that a Proſelyte might lawfully marry his own mother, or his own daughter, born

den. de jure nat. & gent. lib. 2. cap. 2. particularly Wall's introduction to his hiſtory of infant baptiſm, and Gale's reflections on Wall, lett. 9. and 10.

(*a*) John iii. 10. (*b*) ver. 4.

* See Lightfoot. horæ heb. in loc.

born before he became a Proſelyte; they being now no more related to him than any other women. Though ſuch marriages were looked upon as indecent, and on that account not permitted *. Some have ſuppoſed our Saviour refers to the Proſelyte's renunciation of his natural relations, when he ſaith, "If any man come unto me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and ſiſter, yea, and his own life alſo, he cannot be my diſciple (*a*):" And that the ſame is alluded to in the following paſſage of the Pſalmiſt, "Hearken, O daughter, and incline thine ear; forget alſo thine own people and thy father's houſe (*b*)." Tacitus in his character of the Jews, having mentioned their cuſtom of circumciſion, as adopted by Proſelytes, adds, "They then quickly learn to deſpiſe the gods, to renounce their country, and to hold their parents, children and brethren in the utmoſt contempt †." And very probably, this unnatural contempt, which the jewiſh doctors taught Proſelytes to entertain of their neareſt relations, might be one thing, on account of which they are ſaid, to have "made them twofold more the children of hell, than themſelves (*c*)."

3dly, The Proſelyte was now to all intents and purpoſes a Jew ‡, and intitled to a ſhare in the

* Lightfoot, hor. heb. ad Joh. iii. 3. and Selden de jure nat. & gent. lib. v. cap. 18.

(*a*) Luke xiv. 26. (*b*) Pſal. xlv. 10.

† Tacit. hiſtor. lib. v. cap. 5.

(*c*) Matt. xxiii. 15.

‡ Conſult Numb. xv. 15. Eſth. viii. 17. and Joſephus in the place above cited, concerning the Idumeans; where he ſaith, that being circumciſed and living according to the law of Moſes, they were from that time Jews, τὸ λοιπὸν Ἰουδαῖοι.

the privileges and bleſſings of ſuch. He was to be treated with the utmoſt reſpect and kindneſs*; no native Jew might upbraid him with his former idolatry and wickedneſs. Yet it is certain, the Jews were in general apt to look with a very evil eye upon Proſelytes, eſpecially on thoſe who had been Samaritans; for they thought themſelves allowed to hate Samaritans, even though they became Proſelytes, becauſe their anceſtors obſtructed the rebuilding the temple, and the holy city; and for this they would never forgive them, though by admitting them as Proſelytes, they declared their faith and hope, that God had forgiven them.

According to the rabbies, Proſelytes were excluded from many civil advantages, or privileges of the commonwealth, to which Iſraelites by deſcent were entitled †. Certain it is, the law made a difference between one nation and another, as to what is called "entering into the congregation of the Lord (*a*)." Edomites and Egyptians had this privilege in the third generation (*b*); though their immediate children were excluded, their grandchildren were admitted. An Ammonite or Moabite was excluded even "to the tenth generation," ſaith the law, or as it is added, "for ever;" which the Jews take to be explanatory of the tenth generation (*c*). The law was certainly thus underſtood in Nehemiah's time: "On that day they

* See a remarkable paſſage in Philo. lib. 1. de monarchia, apud opera, p. 631, 632. F. G. A. edit. Colon. Allobr. 1613.

† Vid. Selden. de jure naturæ & gent. lib. 2. cap. 4. Oper. tom. 1. p. 194,—196. & de Synedr. lib. 2. cap. 8. tom. 2. p. 1396 & ſeq. edit. Lond. 1726.

(*a*) Deut. xxiii. beginning. (*b*) ver. 7, 8. (*c*) ver. 3.

they read in the book of Moſes in the audience of the people; and therein was found written, that the Ammonite and the Moabite ſhould not enter into the congregation of God for ever, &c. and it came to paſs, when they had heard the law, that they ſeparated from Iſrael all the mixed multitude (*a*). Baſtards were, likewiſe, under the ſame excluſion to the tenth generation, though not for ever (*b*).

It is not certain, what is meant by not "entering into the congregation of the Lord." It cannot be as Ainſworth rightly obſerves *, not adopting the faith and religion of Iſrael, and entering into the church in that reſpect; becauſe it was lawful for all ſo to do (*c*). The hebrew doctors generally underſtand by it, a prohibition of the Iſraelites marrying with ſuch perſons, as are here excluded †. To this it is objected, that "he who is wounded in genitalibus, cui ſunt attriti vel amputati teſtes, or who is totally caſtrated, cui abſciſſum eſt veretrum, is, likewiſe, excluded (*d*)." Now, ſay they, it would be ſuperfluous to forbid women to marry with ſuch perſons, becauſe it cannot be ſuppoſed they would. It may nevertheleſs be replied, though ſuch a prohibition might probably be needleſs, when this their defect was known; it might be requiſite to forbid ſuch perſons marrying, when it was ſecret, as they might be inclined to do for ſeveral politic reaſons. Dr. Patrick, therefore, underſtands by the

(*a*) Nehem. xiii. 1,—3. (*b*) Deut. xxiii. 2.
* in loc.
(*c*) Exod. xii. 48, 49.
† Vid. Selden. de jure naturæ & gent. lib. vi. cap. 16. Oper. tom. 1. p. 576.
(*d*) ver. 1.

the mixed multitude, which, in the forecited paſſage of Nehemiah we are told, was ſeparated from Iſrael by this law, ſuch as were born of ſtrangers, who were not allowed to partake of the rites of marriage with Iſraelites.

But the opinion concerning entering into the congregation, moſt commonly received among chriſtian writers, is, that it ſignifies being permitted to bear any office in the jewiſh commonwealth. And it is certain, ſaith Dr. Patrick, the hebrew word קָהָל kahal, which we render congregation, does in many places ſignify, not the whole body of the people of Iſrael, but the great aſſembly of elders. Thoſe who prefer this ſenſe, aſſign as a reaſon, why eunuchs of all ſorts were excluded, as well as ſtrangers, that they are generally obſerved to want courage, and are therefore unfit for government.

We proceed now to the other ſort of Proſelytes, whom the jewiſh doctors ſtyle גרי שער gere ſhangnar, "ſtrangers of the gate," from an expreſſion which ſeveral times occurs in the moſaic law, "The ſtranger that is within thy gate (*a*)." Or otherwiſe they are called גרי תושב gere toſhabh. Thus in Leviticus we read of "Strangers that ſojourned" among the Iſraelites, התושבים הגרים hattoſhabim haggarim (*b*). Theſe were foreigners, who did not embrace the jewiſh religion, (and are, therefore, improperly called Proſelytes), yet "were ſuffered to live among the Jews" under certain reſtrictions. As

1ſt, That they ſhould not practice idolatry, nor worſhip any other God beſide the God of Iſrael; which under the Theocracy, was "crimen

(*a*) See Deut. xiv. 21. (*b*) Lev. xxv. 45.

men læſæ majeſtatis," and therefore not to be tolerated: "He that ſacrificeth unto any God, ſave the Lord; he ſhall utterly be deſtroyed (*a*)."

2dly, That they ſhould not blaſpheme the God of Iſrael: "He that blaſphemeth the name of the Lord, ſhall ſurely be put to death; as well the ſtranger, as he that is born in the land (*b*)." And perhaps alſo,

3dly, That they ſhould keep the jewiſh ſabbath; ſo far at leaſt, as to refrain from working on that day. For in the fourth commandment the obligation of obſerving the ſabbatical reſt is expreſsly extended to the "Stranger that was within their gates (*c*)."

So long as they lived under theſe reſtrictions in a peaceable manner, the Iſraelites were forbid to "vex or oppreſs them (*d*)." Nevertheleſs they might buy ſlaves out of their families, as well as of the Heathen that were round about them (*e*). But of their brethren the Iſraelites, they were forbid to make ſlaves (*f*). It was lawful to lend upon uſury to theſe ſtrangers, though it was not to an Iſraelite (*g*). They might eat that which died of itſelf, which was prohibited to an Iſraelite (*b*). By the ſtranger, therefore, who was forbidden to "eat blood and that which died of itſelf (*i*)," we muſt neceſſarily underſtand a Proſelyte of righteouſneſs. And ſuch alſo, the jewiſh doctors ſay, is the ſtranger mentioned in the fourth commandment, who was obliged to keep the ſabbath; it being, in their apprehenſion, unlawful for any uncircumciſed perſon to obſerve the law

(*a*) Exod. xxii. 20. (*b*) Lev. xxiv. 16. (*c*) Exod. xx. 10. (*d*) Exod. xxii 21. (*e*) Lev. xxv. 44, 45. (*f*) vet. 39, 40. (*g*) Deut. xxiii. 20. (*b*) Deut. xiv. 21. (*i*) Lev. xvii. 12, 15.

law of Moſes, becauſe it was given peculiarly to Iſrael; "Moſes commanded us a law, even the inheritance of the congregation of Jacob (*a*)," in particular, the law concerning the ſabbath: "Therefore the children of Iſrael ſhall keep the ſabbath, to obſerve the ſabbath throughout their generations for a perpetual covenant. It is a ſign betwixt me and the children of Iſrael for ever (*b*)." But in concluding from hence, that none except native Iſraelites, and ſuch as had joined themſelves to their church, were obliged by the law of the ſabbath; they ſeem to forget, that it was given to Adam, and conſequently to all mankind (*c*). There is no impropriety, therefore, in ſuppoſing, that theſe uncircumciſed ſtrangers were comprehended in the fourth commandment. Beſides, it ſeems reaſonable, that they ſhould be obliged to reſt on the jewiſh ſabbath, leſt their working or recreations ſhould diſturb and hinder the devotion of the Iſraelites.

Theſe ſtrangers were, moreover, permitted to worſhip the God of Iſrael in the outer court of the temple; which for that reaſon was called, "the court of the Gentiles;" to which there is a reference in the charge, given to the angel in the book of the Revelation, to "meaſure the temple of God, and the altar, and them that worſhip therein; but the court, which is without the temple, to leave out, and meaſure it not; becauſe it is given to the Gentiles (*d*). Betwixt this and the inner court, where the Iſraelites aſſembled, there was a wall to which the apoſtle Paul alludes: "For he is our peace,

(*a*) Deut. xxxiii. 4. (*b*) Exod. xxxi. 16, 17.
(*c*) Gen. ii. 3. (*d*) Rev. xi. 2.

who hath made both (Jews and Gentiles) one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us (*a*)." For ſuch worſhippers as theſe ſtrangers, and for their acceptance with God, Solomon prayed at the dedication of the temple, "Moreover concerning a ſtranger, that is not of thy people Iſrael, but cometh out of a far country, for thy name's ſake (for they ſhall hear of thy great name, and of thy ſtrong hand, and of thy ſtretched out arm), when he ſhall come and pray towards this houſe, hear thou in heaven thy dwelling place, and do according to all that the ſtranger calleth to thee for, that all the people of the earth may know thy name to fear thee, as do thy people Iſrael (*b*)."

The numbers of theſe ſtrangers, who dwelt among the Iſraelites, were very conſiderable; we find no leſs than one hundred fifty three thouſand ſix hundred of them, in Solomon's time, employed in ſervile labour (*c*).

This is the ſum of what can be gathered, from ſcripture concerning the גרי שער gere ſhangnar, or תושב toſhabh.

But the talmudical rabbies have made Proſelytes of all theſe ſtrangers and ſojourners *, at leaſt, of all who were in the land of Iſrael when the Jews were their own maſters, and not in ſubjection to any foreign power; for they confeſs, in that caſe, there was no preventing Heathens dwelling among them, even though they refuſed to ſubmit to the reſtrictions of the law; they ſay, therefore, they were no Proſelytes of the gate in ſuch times: but that at other

(*a*) Eph. ii. 14. (*b*) 1 Kings viii. 41,—43.
(*c*) 2 Chron. ii. 17, 18.
* Vid. Selden. de jure nat. et gent. lib. ii. cap. iii.

other times no Gentile was permitted to dwell in the land of Iſrael, without being a Proſelyte of the gate; that is, without ſubmitting to and obeying the ſeven precepts, which the rabbies pretend, God gave to Noah and his ſons, and which, according to them, comprized the law of nature, common to all mankind.

Theſe have been uſually ſtiled the ſeptem præcepta Noachidarum *; by which they were required,—to abſtain from idolatry,—from blaſphemy,—from murder,—from adultery,—from theft:—to inſtitute judges to maintain the laws; and—not to eat the fleſh of any animal, cut off while it was alive.

Maimonides ſaith, the firſt ſix precepts were given to Adam, and the ſeventh to Noah §.

But what creates a ſuſpicion, that this is all invention of the Talmudiſts is, that there is no mention of theſe ſeven precepts being given to the Noachidæ, in ſcripture, in Onkelos, in Joſephus, or in Philo; and that neither Jerom, nor Origen, nor any of the ancient fathers, appear to have been in the leaſt acquainted with them.

However, ſomething like the ſeventh was undoubtedly given to Noah and his poſterity: "The fleſh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, ſhall you not eat (*a*)." Under this reſtriction, they had, preſently after the flood, permiſſion to eat all ſorts of animal food: "Every moving thing, that liveth, ſhall be meat for you; even as the green herb, have I given you all things (*b*)." From whence it has been generally concluded, that the Antediluvians uſed only vegetables; which ſeems, indeed

* Vid. Selden. de jure nat. et gent. lib. 1. cap. x. et Schickard. de jure regio, cum notis Carpzov. p. 333. et ſeq.

§ De regibus, cap. ix. ab init. apud Crenii taſcicul. nonum, p. 133. (*a*) Gen. i. x4. (*b*) ver. 3.

deed, to be the only kind of food God allotted for man at his creation (*a*). Nevertheleſs, immediately after the flood, the permiſſion is extended to "every moving thing that liveth;" that is, to all kind of animals that are fit for food, without any ſuch diſtinction between clean and unclean, as was afterwards made under the jewiſh law.

Some have, indeed, maintained the contrary opinion; ſuppoſing, that the uſe of animal food was included in the general grant of power and dominion, which God gave to Adam over the brute creation (*b*).

The chief arguments, to prove that animal food was not uſed before the deluge, are *,

1ſt, That God's grant, of the uſe of his creatures for food, to Adam, is expreſsly reſtrained to the vegetable creation.

2dly, The ſcripture hiſtory is wholly ſilent concerning the uſe of animal food before the flood.

3dly, If animal food had been then permitted, there could have been no reaſon for this new grant which God gave to Noah.

The chief arguments, alledged on the other ſide, are taken

1ſt, From the hiſtory of Abel's ſacrifice; which is ſaid to have conſiſted of the "firſtlings of his flock, and the fat thereof (*c*)." Now, it having never been uſual to offer any thing in ſacrifice to God, but what was uſeful to man, it is concluded from this account, that animals were, at that time, uſed for food.

Never-

(*a*) Gen. i. 29, 30. (*b*) Gen. i. 26,—28.

* On this debate conſult Heidegger. hiſtor. Patriarch. tom. i. exercit. xv.

(*c*) Gen. iv. 4.

Nevertheleſs, this will not follow, becauſe Abel's flock might be kept for the ſake of the milk and wool; which render theſe creatures exceeding ſerviceable.

It muſt be owned, that the particular mention of the fat, in the account of this ſacrifice, might incline one to think it was a peace offering; the fat of which was conſumed upon the altar, and the fleſh eat by the perſon at whoſe charge the offering was made, and by the prieſts (*a*). But the affix of the word, חלבהן chelbehen, which we tranſlate "the fat thereof," ſhould rather be rendered "of them;" namely, of the firſtlings of his flock; intimating, not that he offered the fat of the animal; but the fatteſt or beſt amongſt them. The word חלב chelebh, is often uſed for the beſt of its kind, whatever be the thing ſpoken of. Thus חלב חטה chelebh chittah, is well rendered "the fineſt of the wheat (*b*)." The fat of the oil, and the fat of the wine, mean the beſt of their kind, as our tranſlators have rendered it (*c*). The "fat of the land" means the beſt of its produce (*d*). Thus it ſeems moſt natural to underſtand the word חלב chelebh, in the preſent caſe; importing, that Abel brought the beſt of his flock for an offering to the Lord: This, we ſuppoſe, was a whole burnt offering, or ſacrifice of atonement; which, according to the law afterward given to Moſes, was entirely conſumed on the Altar; except the ſkin, which was the prieſt's fee for killing and offering it (*e*).

(*a*) Lev. iii. per totum. chap. vii. 15, 33. (*b*) Pſal. lxxxi. 16. cxlvii. 14. (*c*) Numb. xviii. 12. (*d*) Gen. xlv. 18. (*e*) Lev. vii. 8.

There were many other ſorts of ſacrifices, afterwards appointed by the law of Moſes; which had a political, as well as religious uſe; as we ſhowed in a former lecture. But the deſign of the whole burnt offering was entirely religious, to impreſs the conſcience with a ſenſe of the deſerved puniſhment of ſin, and to typify the great atonement which Chriſt, in due time, was to offer. There was the ſame reaſon, therefore, for theſe ſacrifices before the time of Moſes, as there was afterwards; and it is probable, that they were inſtituted preſently after the fall, and that of the ſkins of the animals ſlain for ſacrifice, God made thoſe garments for Adam and Eve, which are ſpoken of in the third chapter of Geneſis (*a*); that is, directed them to make them: as Jacob is ſaid to have made his ſon Joſeph a coat of many colours (*b*); or ordered it to be made.

Upon the whole, the hiſtory of Abel's ſacrifice affords no proof of men's eating animal food before the flood. We proceed therefore,

2dly, To another argument in favour of this opinion, built upon the diſtinction of the creatures into clean and unclean, before Noah entered into the ark (*c*). Now it is alledged, that we cannot conceive of any cleaneſs or uncleanneſs in thoſe animals themſelves; but merely as ſome are more fit for food than others, or as God is pleaſed to permit the uſe of ſome, and not of others; and therefore it is ſaid, this diſtinction of them before the flood, muſt imply, that animal food was uſed at that time.

To this it has been replied by ſome, that the diſtinction is uſed by Moſes, in his hiſtory of thoſe

(*a*) ver. 21. (*b*) Gen. xxxvii. 3. (*c*) Gen. vii. 2.

thoſe early times, proleptically. Cyrenius is called governor of Syria by St. Luke, in relating what he did at the time of our Saviour's birth, though he was not made governor of Syria till ſeveral years after. So we may ſuppoſe Moſes, in his hiſtory of the deluge, ranges the animals that went into the ark, into clean and unclean, according to the diſtinction, afterwards made betwixt them by the law, and well known when he wrote. This anſwer, perhaps, hath too much the air of a ſubterfuge, to be perfectly ſatisfactory.

Suppoſe then we make this reply, that the terms, "clean and unclean," do not here reſpect the diſtinction, afterwards made by the jewiſh law; but a natural difference, which may be obſerved, in moſt of the creatures, that God allowed or forbid to be eat by the Jews. The clean, have no upper cutting teeth, their fat hardens into ſuet, they riſe up with their hind feet firſt; in all which reſpects they are the reverſe of the unclean. Such a diſtinction therefore, men would naturally make, not only when animal food came to be uſed, but probably before.

However, ſuppoſe it ſhould reſpect the uſe of them for food, it will not follow, becauſe God commanded above three times as many more of the clean creatures, than of the unclean, to be preſerved in the ark, that men uſed them for food before the flood. It ſeems more probable, that this diſtinction was now firſt made, and a greater number of thoſe which were moſt fit for food preſerved, merely becauſe God intended to permit the uſe of them in a very ſhort time.

There is another queſtion on this head, which ſhould be a little conſidered before we diſmiſs the ſubject: For what reaſon were the Antediluvians not allowed to make uſe of animal food, as well as Noah and his poſterity after the flood?

The more commonly received opinion is, that, it was to preſerve their lives, that the world might be ſpeedily repleniſhed with inhabitants; becauſe the free uſe of fleſh would impair their conſtitution and ſhorten their days. Their longevity is accordingly imputed to their ſobriety, and the ſimplicity of their diet, and in particular to their living only on vegetables. But this would make God's grant of animal food to Noah, a curſe inſtead of a bleſſing. Beſides, it is not certain, that the moderate uſe of it is at all prejudicial to health. If it were, why hath God formed us with teeth ſo peculiarly adapted to the maſtication of it, and with a ſtomach ſuited to digeſt it? Beverovicius, a learned phyſician *, is ſo far from being convinced, that eating fleſh is unſalutary, and tends to ſhorten men's lives, that among ſeveral cauſes of the longevity of the Antediluvians, one, which he aſſigns, is, their eating raw fleſh; the beſt and moſt nouriſhing parts of which, he ſuppoſes to be carried off in dreſſing by the action of the fire. But though there is great reaſon to conclude, the Antediluvians eat no fleſh, I can ſee no good reaſon to impute their longevity to abſtaining from it, or to believe, that it was for the ſake of their health, God did not allow them to uſe it.

I ſhall take the liberty, myſelf, to offer a conjecture. Suppoſing the lives of animals were no

* Vid. ejus Theſaurum ſanitatis, *lib.* 3. et apud Heidegger. hiſtor. Patriarch. tom. 1. exer. xiv. de eorum long. §. xx.

no longer before the flood, and conſequently their increaſe no greater than at preſent, while the lives of men were ten times as long, and their increaſe conſequently ten times greater; there was then, an evident reaſon, why animal food was not permitted, from the inſufficient number of animals, inſomuch that the uſe of them would, probably, in a few years have deſtroyed the whole ſpecies. For now mens lives are ſhortened, and their increaſe ten times leſs, there is only ſuch a proportion betwixt the human and brutal ſpecies, as ordinarily, prevents the want of animal food without overſtocking us. Divine wiſdom therefore did not make this grant, till it thought fit to contract the life of man; which was immediately after the deluge.

Godwin, who relies on the authority of the talmudical rabbies for his account of the Proſelytes of the gate, produces, out of the ſcripture hiſtory, four inſtances of ſuch Proſelytes; Naaman the Syrian (*a*), Cornelius the roman centurion (*b*), the ethiopian eunuch (*c*), and thoſe devout men, ανδρες ευλαβεις, "out of every nation under heaven," who are ſaid to be dwelling at Jeruſalem (*d*). But none of theſe are ſufficient to ſupport the rabbinical account of ſuch Proſelytes.

1ſt, As for Naaman, who was by birth a Syrian, and general of king Benhadad's army, he appears to have been a gentile idolater. But being miraculouſly cured of his leproſy by the power of the God of Iſrael, and the direction of his prophet Eliſha, he renounced his idolatry,

(*a*) 2 Kings v. (*b*) Acts x. (*c*) Acts viii. 27. (*d*) Acts ii. 5.

try, acknowledged this God to be the only true God (*a*), ("behold, now I know, that there is no God in all the earth, but in Iſrael") and promiſed for the time to come, that he would worſhip none other but Jehovah (*b*). He alſo requeſted the prophet, that he might have two mules load of earth, to carry home with him from the land of Iſrael, moſt probably intending to build an altar with it in his own country; as ſeems indeed to be implied in the reaſon with which he inforces his requeſt, "Shall there not, I pray thee, be given to thy ſervant two mules burden of earth: for thy ſervant will henceforth offer neither burnt offering, nor ſacrifice to other gods, but unto Jehovah (*c*)." This requeſt ſeems to have been, partly founded on a ſuperſtitious opinion he had conceived of ſome peculiar holineſs and virtue in the earth of the country; ſo that he ſuppoſed an altar built of it would be more pleaſing, and render his ſacrifice more acceptable, to God, than if it were made of any other materials. Perhaps he had formed this notion, upon finding ſuch a miraculous virtue in the water of Jordan, that barely waſhing in it had effected his cure; and he concluded, therefore, the earth muſt have, likewiſe, ſome extraordinary virtue. Yet he did not conceive, this was owing to any thing peculiar in the nature of that water and that earth; but that God had miraculouſly infuſed into them this virtue; and he thought it, therefore, beſt to worſhip him at an altar of that earth, which he had peculiarly ſanctified.

Or

(*a*) 2 Kings v. 15. (*b*) ver. 17. (*c*) ubi ſupra.

Or it may be, by this ſymbol of an altar built of the earth of the land of Iſrael, he meant to ſignify his communion with that people in the worſhip of the true God.

He further deſired, this earth might be given him by the prophet, probably ſuppoſing, his conſent, and his bleſſing upon it, would render it more efficacious for the acceptableneſs of his ſacrifice, than if he had taken it without his permiſſion.

He further ſays, "In this the Lord pardon thy ſervant, that when my maſter goes into the houſe of Rimmon, to worſhip there, and he leaneth upon my hand, and I bow myſelf in the houſe of Rimmon; when I bow down in the houſe of Rimmon, the Lord pardon thy ſervant in this thing (*a*):" which ſome underſtand to be a reſerve, denoting he would renounce idolatry no further then was conſiſtent with his worldly intereſt, with his princes favour, and his place at court. But if ſo, the prophet would hardly have diſmiſſed him with a bleſſing, ſaying, "Go in peace (*b*)."

Others therefore ſuppoſe that in theſe words, he begs pardon for what he had done in times paſt, not for what he ſhould continue to do. They obſerve, that השתחויתי hiſhtachvethi, though rendered in the future tenſe by the targum, and by all the ancient verſions, is really the preterperfect; and they, therefore, underſtand it, "when I have bowed myſelf," or "becauſe I have bowed myſelf" in the houſe of Rimmon, the Lord pardon thy ſervant. With this ſenſe Dr. Lightfoot agrees *, and it is

(*a*) ver. 18. (*b*) ver. 19.

* Vid. Hor. hebr. in Luke iv. 27.

is defended by the learned Bochart in a large diſſertation on the caſe of Naaman. Yet to me it does not ſeem very probable; that, if he meant this for a penitential acknowledgment of his former idolatry, he ſhould only mention what he had done as the king's ſervant, and not his own voluntary worſhipping the idol.

The more probable opinion, therefore, is, that he conſulted the prophet, whether it was lawful for him, having renounced idolatry and publickly profeſſed the worſhip of the true God, ſtill, in virtue of his office, to attend his maſter in the temple of Rimmon; in order that he might lean upon him, either out of ſtate, or perhaps out of bodily weakneſs; becauſe if he attended him, as he had formerly done, he could not avoid bowing down, when he did. To this the prophet returns no direct anſwer; leaſt, if on the one hand he had declared it unlawful, he ſhould have too much diſcouraged this new convert, before he was well eſtabliſhed in the true religion; or if on the other he had declared it lawful, he ſhould ſeem to give countenance to idolatry. He, therefore, made no other reply, but "Go in peace."

After this we have no further mention of Naaman. But in the following account of the wars betwixt Syria and Iſrael, Benhadad ſeems to have commanded his army in perſon. From whence Mr. Bedford *, infers, that Naaman was diſmiſſed from the command, for refuſing to worſhip Rimmon. But the premiſſes are not ſufficient to ſupport the concluſion; for it appears

* See his ſcripture chronology, p. 627. edit. Lond. 1730.

appears that Benhadad had commanded his army in perſon twice before, once in the ſiege of Samaria (*a*), and once at Aphek (*b*). Yet from the total ſilence concerning Naaman it is probably enough conjectured, that he either died, or reſigned, or was diſmiſſed ſoon after his return.

Well! but though Naaman renounced idolatry, and became a worſhipper of the true God; yet he could not be a Proſelyte of the gate, according to the account the Talmudiſts give of theſe Proſelytes, becauſe he did not dwell in the Land of Iſrael, but returned into Syria. If therefore he became a Proſelyte at all, it muſt have been a Proſelyte of the covenant; though perhaps, when he lived in another country, there was no need, in order to his being an acceptable worſhipper of the true God, for his ſubmitting to the whole jewiſh law. We are rather therefore to account him a pious gentile, than a jewiſh Proſelyte.

Tradition reports, that Gehazi, the prophet's ſervant, being ſtruck with the leproſy, moved Naaman to erect an hoſpital for ſuch unhappy perſons at Damaſcus. Thevenot tells us, that there is ſuch an hoſpital, richly endowed, juſt by the walls of that city, which owns Naaman for its founder *.

It may not be amiſs to obſerve from Dr. Patrick, that Naaman's was the only miraculous cure of the leproſy, recorded in the ſcripture hiſtory, till Chriſt the great prophet came into the world. And how beneficent a miracle it was, we may conclude from the account which Maundrell

(*a*) 1 Kings xx. 1. (*b*) ver. 26.

* See his travels to the Levant, part 2. book 1. chap. 4.

Maundrell gives of that diſeaſe in thoſe parts of the world*. He ſays, it differs much from that which is found amongſt us; it defiles the whole ſurface of the body with a foul ſcurf, deforms the joints, particularly at the wriſts and ankles, which ſwell with a gouty ſcrophylous ſubſtance, very loathſome to look on. The legs of thoſe that are affected with this diſtemper, look like an old battered horſe's; in ſhort it may paſs for the utmoſt corruption of the human body on this ſide the grave.

The next ſcripture inſtance of Proſelytes of the gate, mentioned by Godwin, is Cornelius the roman centurion, whoſe character is, that he was "a devout man, and one that feared God with all his houſe, who gave alms to the people, and prayed to God always (*a*)." Yet it is evident, he was in no ſenſe a jewiſh Proſelyte, becauſe, in the account of the Jews themſelves he was an unclean perſon, ſuch a one, as it was not lawful for them to keep company with. Nor would Peter have gone into his houſe, if he had not been inſtructed ſo to do by a ſpecial revelation; which appears from the manner of his juſtifying this viſit to Cornelius, ſo contrary to the received maxims of the Jews: "Ye know, ſaith he, that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company with, or come unto one of another nation; but God has ſhewed me that I ſhould not call any man common, or unclean; therefore came I unto you without gainſaying, as ſoon as I was ſent for (*b*)." The jewiſh Chriſtians at Jeruſalem, likewiſe blamed Peter for this viſit; "Thou wenteſt, ſay they, to men

* See his ſecond letter to Mr. Oſborn, at the end of his journey from Aleppo to Jeruſalem, p. 150, 151. edit. 7. Oxford, 1749.

(*a*) Acts x. 2. (*b*) Acts x. 28, 29.

men uncircumciſed, and didſt eat with them (*a*)." Which ſhows, that they did not look upon him at all as a Proſelyte, for with ſuch they might lawfully converſe and eat. However he was, indeed, of the character St. Peter mentions, one "who feared God, and wrought righteouſneſs, and was accepted of him (*b*);" notwithſtanding he was no way related to the Jews, except in the worſhip of the one true God.

We may obſerve further, that Cornelius could not be a Proſelyte of the gate, according to the Talmudiſts account, becauſe the jewiſh nation was at that time under the roman yoke; and in theſe circumſtances, according to them, there could be no ſuch Proſelytes. That he was not a Proſelyte of the covenant, is plain, becauſe he, and his family, and friends were the firſt fruits of the Gentiles. He was, therefore, in no ſenſe a Jew, or a Proſelyte.

As for the ethiopian eunuch, whom Philip converted to the faith of Chriſt, and baptized (*c*); he alſo, is improperly reckoned among the Proſelytes of the gate, for the ſame reaſon that Naaman is, becauſe he did not live in the land of Judea; and for the ſame reaſon that Cornelius is, becauſe the Jews were not then their own maſters, but ſubject to a foreign power; for at ſuch a time, the rabbies ſay, there could be no Proſelytes of the gate.

He ſeems to have been rather a Proſelyte of the covenant, or compleatly a Jew; not only from his reading the ſcripture, but becauſe he had taken ſo long a journey, to "worſhip at Jeruſalem

(*a*) chap. xi. 3. (*b*) chap. x. 35. (*c*) Acts viii. 26. et ſeq.

Jeruſalem (a)," at the feaſt of Pentecoſt; one of the three grand feſtivals, when all the jewiſh males who were able, were, according to the law, to attend the worſhip of God at the national altar. He had taken, I ſay, a very long journey; for his country was doubtleſs the Ethiopia in Africa, where, about that time, queen Candace reigned; as we learn from Strabo *, and from Dion Caſſius †, who informs us that Petronius, the prefect of Egypt, marched an army againſt Candace into Ethiopia, where he ravaged the country a conſiderable time, till the deep ſands, and exceſſive heats, obliged him to return: which event was but about ten or eleven years before the affair here related of the eunuch. And Pliny, ſpeaking of that country, ſaith, "there reigns Candace," quod nomen multis jam annis ad reginas tranſiit ‡.

Probably this eunuch, who was treaſurer of Ethiopia, had been made a Proſelyte by thoſe Jews, who ſpread themſelves from Alexandria in Egypt, into that country. But the preſent Ethiopians, or Abyſſines, who are Chriſtians of the greek church, maintain that the jewiſh religion was univerſally embraced in their country, from the days of Solomon. It hath been a conſtant tradition among them, that the queen of Sheba, who went to viſit him, was their empreſs; that ſhe had a ſon by him, named David; who, as ſoon as he was of a proper age to undertake ſuch a journey, was ſent

(a) ver. 27.

* Strabo xvii. p. 820. edit. Caſaub. Paris. 1620.

† Dion. lib. liv. §. 5. tom. 1. p. 734. edit. Reimari.

‡ Plin. hiſtor. natural. lib. 6. cap. 29. in fin. vol. 1. p. 740. edit. Harduin. Paris. 1685.

ſent by her to Jeruſalem, to receive his father's bleſſing, and be inſtructed in the law of Moſes; that being made throughly acquainted with the jewiſh religion, he was ſent home, with ſeveral prieſts and Levites to aſſiſt him in introducing it into Ethiopia; and they were ſo ſucceſsful in their miſſion, that in a few years it was embraced by the whole body of the people, and continued to be the public profeſſion, till the promulgation of the goſpel in that country.

It is a tradition, likewiſe, among them, that the eunuch, baptized by Philip, was ſteward to their empreſs, and that returning home, he converted his miſtreſs, and the whole empire to the chriſtian faith.

Though we cannot depend upon this latter ſtory, yet it muſt be owned to have a far greater air of probability, than the fable of the queen of Sheba and her ſon, and indeed than moſt of the traditional ſtories of the firſt converſions of countries *.

The laſt inſtance, which Godwin produces, of Proſelytes of the gate, is, "the devout men, out of every nation under heaven, who dwelt at Jeruſalem," and are mentioned in the Acts (*a*). But theſe devout men are expreſsly ſaid to be Jews; that is, Jews by religion, not by nation; for they belonged to ſeveral nations. And though they are afterwards diſtinguiſhed into Jews and Proſelytes (*b*), that doubtleſs means ſuch as were born of jewiſh parents, though in a foreign country, and who had been brought up in their religion; or ſuch as were born of gentile parents, and had become

* Geddes's church hiſtory of Ethiopia, p. 8.

(*a*) Acts ii. 5. (*b*) ver. 10.

Proſelytes to it. Beſides, there is the ſame reaſon againſt acknowledging them to be Proſelytes of the gate, as there is againſt acknowledging Cornelius and the eunuch to be ſuch; namely, that the Jews were, at that time, ſubject to the roman power.

Upon the whole, there does not appear to be ſufficient evidence in the ſcripture hiſtory of the exiſtence of ſuch Proſelytes of the gate, as the rabbies mention; nor indeed of any, who with propriety can be ſtiled Proſelytes, except ſuch as fully embraced the jewiſh religion.

Concerning the Proſelytes of the gate, vid. Maimon. de regibus, cap. viii. §. x. xi. & cap. ix. x. cum notis Leydecker. apud Crenii Faſcicul. nonum, vel Leydeck. de republ. Hebræor. lib. vi. cap. vii.

Concerning the Proſelytes of righteouſneſs, vid. Maimon. de vetito concubitu, apud Leydecker, de republicâ Hebræor. lib. vi. cap. vi. p. 364. et ſeq. Amſtel. 1704. & Selden. de jure nat. & gent. cap. ii. ſupra citat. & cap. iii.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Of their KINGS.

THE alteration made in the form of the hebrew conſtitution, which originally was a proper Theocracy, by ſetting up the regal government, hath been already conſidered. As it was plainly an act of rebellion againſt God to make any change in his original ſettlement, the Jews are therefore, charged with "rejecting him, that he ſhould not reign over them, when they deſired to have a king, to judge them like all the nations (*a*)." Nevertheleſs, as he permitted divorces "becauſe of the hardneſs of their hearts (*b*);" in like manner, foreſeeing the perverſe diſpoſition they would have, after their ſettlement in Canaan, to ſuch an alteration, he was pleaſed to give them ſome rules, beforehand, concerning their choice of a king, and the manner of his adminiſtration (*c*). Some of the rabbies, in order to exculpate their nation from the charge of rebellion on this occaſion, would have this permiſſion and regulation

(*a*) 1 Sam. viii. 5, 6, 7. (*b*) Matt. xix. 8.
(*c*) Deut. xvii. 14, to the end.

amount to an injunction to chooſe a king. Maimonides tells us *, out of the babyloniſh Gemara †, that Moſes gave the Iſraelites three expreſs commandments, to elect a king, to deſtroy Amalek, and to build a temple, after they were poſſeſſed of the land of Canaan. He obſerves, that they accordingly, choſe Saul for their king, before they declared war againſt the Amalekites. But if this had been deſigned, and underſtood as a command, they would no doubt have choſen a king preſently after their ſettlement in Canaan, and not have delayed it for upwards of three hundred years ‡. We cannot ſuppoſe, but Samuel would have put them upon chuſing a king in obedience to the law of God, long before they deſired one; and not have blamed them, as he did, when they expreſſed that deſire (*a*). Many of the rabbies are, therefore, of a contrary opinion §; and ſo is Joſephus, who imputes this deſire of a kingly government ‖ to the intolerable corruption which had crept into all the courts of

* De regibus, cap. 1. ab init.

† Sanhedrin, cap. 23. in excerptis Cocceii, cap. xi. §. 6.

‡ Si petitio regis abſolutè, inquit Abarbanel, fuit legitima, & præceptum legis, & non peccatum fuit, niſi in modo petendi, vel in fine, tempore, aut intentione ejus; quare Joſhua & cæteri judices Iſraelis, ipſum ſecuti, nunquam cogitarunt de rege in Iſraele conſtituendo, cum hoc ipſis præceptum eſſet, quum ingrederentur terram? Quomodo omnes tranſgreſſi ſunt hoc præceptum, cum eſſent in terrâ poſt ejus occupationem & diviſionem? Nullum hactenus interpretum vidi, qui de hoc egerit, & ad hoc aliquid reſponderit. Abarbanel. diſſert. 2 de ſtatu & jure regio, ad calcem Buxtorfii diſſertationum, p. 427. edit. Baſil. 1662.

(*a*) 1 Sam. x 19.

§. Vid. Abarbanel. ubi ſupra, p. 424. & ſeq.

‖ Agreeably to 1 Sam. viii. 5.

of juſtice through the baſeneſs and avarice of Samuel's two ſons *. And he introduces his account of the regulations in Deuteronomy concerning their kings, with obſerving, that they ought not to have affected any other government, but to have loved the preſent; having the law for their maſter, and living according to it; for it was ſufficient that God was their ruler †. That their deſire of a king was diſpleaſing to God, ſeems alſo to be intimated in the prophecy of Hoſea, "I gave thee a king in mine anger, and took him away in my wrath (*a*)." Referring to Saul, the firſt king, on occaſion of whoſe election God expreſſed his diſpleaſure by terrible thunder (*b*); and to Zedekiah, the laſt king, whom he ſuffered, together with his ſubjects, to be carried captive to Babylon. Maimonides indeed, pretends, that the ſin, for which the people were reproved by Samuel, did not conſiſt in their deſiring a king, but in their coming to him in a tumultuous and diſreſpectful manner, and aſking a king, not in obedience to the divine command, but becauſe they diſdained his government ‡. This, however, is by no means agreeable to the ſcripture account, which evidently lays the blame on the deſiring a king §, not on the manner, in which that deſire was expreſſed: "The thing diſpleaſed Samuel, when they ſaid, give us a king to judge us. And Samuel prayed

* Antiq. lib. vi. cap. iii. §. 3. edit. Haverc.
† lib. iv. cap. viii. §. 17.
(*a*) Hoſ. xiii. 11. (*b*) 1 Sam. xii. 17, 18.
‡ de regibus, cap. 1. §. 2.
§ In redargutione Samuelis, inquit Abarbanel, ſemper attribuitur peccatum petitioni regis abſolutè, &c. Ubi ſupra, p. 427.

unto the Lord. And the Lord said unto Samuel, hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee; for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them (*a*)." The law therefore in the seventeenth chapter of Deuteronomy, must be looked upon, not as a command, nor hardly as a permission, to choose a king *; for if they had supposed it to amount even to a permission, no doubt they would have alledged it to Samuel; nor is it easy to see, how their "wickedness would, then, have been so great in asking a king," as it is represented to be. It must be considered, therefore, rather as a restraining law, that in case they would have a king, it should be under such limitations, as God then prescribed. Which are the eight following,

1st, That the choice of the person to be their king, God would reserve to himself. They must not say, "I will set a king over me, like as all the nations that are round about me; but thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee, whom the Lord thy God will chuse (*b*)." Accordingly, he appointed Saul, by lot, to be their first king (*c*); and David, by name, to be their second king (*d*). He likewise chose Solomon to be David's successor (*e*); and, after him, he made the kingly government hereditary in David's family (*f*). Nevertheless, this divine

(*a*) 1 Sam. viii. 6, 7.

* Abarbanel makes several judicious observations, to shew it was no command, in his dissertation above quoted, p. 436. & seq.

(*b*) Deut. xvii. 14, 15 (*c*) 1 Sam. x. 21.
(*d*) 1 Sam. xvi. 12. (*e*) 1 Chron. xxviii. 5.
(*f*) 1 Kings ii. 4.

divine choice and appointment only reſtrained the people from making any other perſon king than him whom God had nominated; but it did not actually inveſt him with the regal authority; that was done by an act of the people *. Thus, after God had appointed David to be king, in token of which he had been anointed by Samuel (*a*); yet the men of Judah anointed him king over the houſe of Judah; whereby they declared their concurrence, and acceptance of him for their king (*b*). And upon the death of Solomon, though the crown was then hereditary, "all Iſrael came to Shechem to make his ſon Rehoboam king (*c*)."

2dly, The king muſt be a native Iſraelite, not a Heathen, nor a Proſelyte. "One from among thy brethren ſhalt thou ſet over thee; thou mayeſt not ſet a ſtranger over thee, who is not thy brother (*d*)." It may naturally be enquired, what occaſion was there for this limitation, when God had reſerved the choice of the perſon to himſelf. I anſwer, more effectually to unite the people againſt any foreign invader, and any one who might attempt to ſeize the crown. The Miſhna relates †, that when king Agrippa, an idumean proſelyte, met with this text, as he was reading in publick, he burſt into tears, becauſe he was not of the ſeed of Iſrael. The people, however, encouraged him, crying

* Per "ponere regem," inquit Abarbanel, intelligitur ejus conſtitutio per populum; ſed electio divina facta fuit per prophetam, mediante unctione. Abarbanel. diſſert. 3. p. 451. ad calcem Buxtorf. diſſert. philolog. theolog. edit. Baſil. 1662.

(*a*) 1 Sam. xvi. 13. (*b*) 2 Sam. ii. 4. (*c*) 1 Kings xii. 1. (*d*) Deut. xvii. 14. 15.

† Miſh. in Sota, ſive de uxore adulterii ſuſpecta, cap. 7. §. 8. edit. Surenhuſii, tom. 3. p. 268.

crying out, Fear not Agrippa, thou art our brother: probably, becauſe the children of Eſau, from whom the Idumeans are deſcended, are called, in Deuteronomy the brethren of the Jews (*a*)."

3dly, The king was not to multiply horſes; and is particularly forbid, therefore, ſending to Egypt for them (*b*); where was the chief breed of thoſe animals in that part of the world. The Egyptian cavalry, which invaded Judea in the reign of Rehoboam, conſiſted of twelve hundred chariots, and ſixty thouſand horſemen (*c*). The reaſon of the king's being prohibited to multiply horſes, hath been commonly thought to be, to reſtrain him from affecting unneceſſary pomp, expenſive to himſelf, and burdenſome to his people. If ſo, Solomon was egregiouſly guilty of tranſgreſſing this law; who had horſes brought out of Egypt (*d*); and, according to the account in the firſt book of Kings, had forty thouſand ſtalls of horſes for his chariots, and twelve thouſand horſemen (*e*); or, according to the lower account in Chronicles, four thouſand ſtalls for horſes and chariots, and twelve thouſand horſemen (*f*). Perhaps, theſe two accounts are beſt reconciled by allowing ten horſes to each ſtall mentioned in Chronicles. Or, the word ſignifying either ſtable or ſtall, in Chronicles it may mean the former; in Kings, the latter *.

Dr. Warburton, in his divine legation of Moſes, ſuppoſes it was the true and ſole deſign of this law, to forbid the Jews the uſe of cavalry in their

(*a*) Deut. ii. 4. (*b*) Deut. xvii. 16. (*c*) 2 Chron. xii. 2, 3. (*d*) 1 Kings x. 28. (*e*) 1 Kings iv. 26. (*f*) 2 Chron. ix. 25.

* Stockii Clavis in verb.

their armies; which he ſays, God did on purpoſe to make it manifeſt, that he protected that nation by a ſpecial providence *. If ſo, Solomon does not ſeem to have violated this law ſo groſsly, as hath been commonly imagined; for though he kept ſuch a multitude of chariots for ſtate, and had twelve thouſand horſemen for his lifeguard; yet it does not appear, that he had any cavalry deſigned for war.

4thly, The king is forbidden "multiplying wives to himſelf, that his heart turn not away (*a*)." The moſt natural expoſition of which law is, that it prohibits polygamy, or having more wives than one. For it is not here ſaid, "He ſhall not greatly multiply," as it is in the next clauſe, concerning ſilver and gold; but ſimply, "he ſhall not multiply." The rabbies, indeed, enlarge the number of wives, allowed the king to eighteen; and underſtand the law as only forbidding his having more †: which they attempt to ground on David's having ſix wives, a liſt of whom we have in the ſecond book of Samuel (*b*); compared with what the prophet afterwards tells him, that if he had not offended God, he "would moreover have given him ſuch and ſuch things (*c*); which they interpret of twice as many wives

* Senſus eſt, inquit Abarbanel, regem ſibi non debere multiplicare equos ex terra vel ſua vel aliorum; neque confidere ſuæ multitudini & potentiæ, non equis & equitibus numeroſis, ſed unicam ſuam fiduciam debere eſſe Deum. Ubi ſupra, p. 440.

(*a*) Deut. xvii. 17.

† Miſh. Sanhedrin, cap. 2. §. 4. tom. 4. p. 217. edit. Surenhus. & Gemar. in excerptis Cocceii, cap. 2. §. 8.

(*b*) chap. iii. 2,—5.

(*c*) chap. xii. 8.

wives more; in all eighteen *. And in their opinion no king ſhould have a greater number than God would have allowed David. Solomon, without doubt, heinouſly tranſgreſſed this law; who had ſeven hundred wives and three hundred concubines (*a*). And the ſad effect was, what this law was intended to prevent, that they "turned away his heart from God."

5thly, The king is alſo forbid, "greatly to multiply to himſelf ſilver and gold (*b*)." This Solomon did in a remarkable manner; for it is ſaid, that "the weight of gold, that came to him in one year, was ſix hundred threeſcore and ſix talents; beſides what he received from the merchantmen, and in particular from the traffick of the ſpice merchants, and from the kings of Arabia, and from the governors of the country; and that, beſides a vaſt quantity of targets and ſhields all of beaten gold, and a throne overlaid with gold, all his drinking veſſels, and all the veſſels of the houſe of the foreſt of Lebanon were of this precious metal, ſilver being in Jeruſalem in a manner as plenty as ſtones, and little eſteemed in his days (*c*)." Notwithſtanding no particular reaſon is given for this prohibition of multiplying ſilver and gold, we may eaſily conceive, the deſign of it was, partly to prevent the kings oppreſſing the people with taxes, in order to enrich himſelf; as ſeems to have been done by Rehoboam, whoſe treaſurer the people, therefore, ſtoned (*d*): and partly to reſtrain him from Luxury, the common effect of riches; leſt the king's example

* R. Ob. de Bartenora in Miſh. capite ſupra citato, p. 118.

(*a*) 1 Kings xi. 3. (*b*) Deut. xvii. 17. (*c*) 1 Kings x. 14,—27. (*d*) 1 Kings xii. 18.

ample should debauch and infeeble the nation, and prove its ruin; as the wealth, and consequent luxury of the Persians, proved the destruction of their empire. The rabbins indeed observe, that this law forbids only the kings multiplying gold and silver to himself, or to his own private coffers, but not to the publick treasury, or for national exigencies.

6thly, The king is injoined to write for himself a copy of the law in a book out of that which is before the priests and levites (a); that is, from the authentic copy kept in the sanctuary. Interpreters differ about the meaning of the word משנה mishne, which we render a copy. The seventy translate it δευτερονομιον, and the vulgate deuteronomium, that translation generally following the version of the seventy. From whence some have imagined that the king was obliged to transcribe only the book of Deuteronomy †. Montanus renders it: duplum; which version agrees with Maimonides's interpretation of this law, that "the king was to write the book of the law for himself, beside the book that was left him by his father; and if his father had left him none, or if that were lost, he was to write him two books of the law ‡, the one he was to keep in his archives, the other was not to depart from him; unless when he went to his throne, or to the

§ Maimon. de regibus, cap. iii. §. 4. Misn. Sanhedrin. cap. 2. §. 4. & Maimon. in loc. tom. 4. p. 218. edit. Surenhus.

(a) Deut. xvii. 18.

† Vid. Abarbanel. comment. in loc. five differt. ubi supra, p. 441.

‡ This was likewise the opinion of many other jewish doctors. Vid. Carpzov. annot. ad Schickard. jus reg. p. 82.

the bath, or to a place where reading would be inconvenient. If he went to war, it accompanied him; if he ſate in judgment, it was to be by him *." But the word does not import any more than a ſingle examplar or copy †. Joſhua is ſaid to have engraved on the ſtones, which he erected on mount Ebal, a copy of the law, משנה miſhne; a ſecond, of which the autograph was the firſt ‡. The deſign of this precept was, undoubtedly, to rivet the divine laws more firmly in the memory of the kings; on which, and of their obligations to obſerve them, they became, through the neglect of this precept, ſo ignorant in the days of good king Joſiah, that he was ſtrangely ſurprized at what he heard read out of this book of the law §, when it was found in the temple, after he had reigned about eighteen years (*a*).

7thly, The king was bound to govern by law: For it is injoined him, that he read in this

* De regibus, lib. iii. §. 1.

† And ſo the Miſhna underſtands it, Sanhedrin, cap. 2. §. 2.

‡ Vid. Leidecker. not. ad Maimon. de regibus, lib. ii. §. 1. § It is the opinion of Abarbanel, that this book was the autograph of Moſes, which no doubt was a diſcovery, that would occaſion equal pleaſure and ſurprize. To confirm this opinion, Leuſden obſerves, that התורה thorah, having the He emphatic prefixed in 2 Kings xxii. 11. ſignifieth that very book of the law which was wrote ביד משה bejadh Moſeh, by the hand of Moſes, as it is expreſſed in the parallel place in Chronicles, which Dr. Kennicott obſerves is a phraſe which only occurs there, and naturally means one particular MS. namely the original. Leuſd. Philolog. Hebræo. mixt. diſſert. xxvi. § xv. p. 175, edit. 2da. Kennicott's ſecond diſſert. on the Heb. text, p. 299, 300. See alſo Leland's anſwer to Chriſtianity as old as the creation, vol. 2. chap. 4. p. 123, —126. Dublin edit. 1733.

(*a*) 2 Chron. xxxiv. 18, & ſeq.

this copy of the law all the days of his life, that he may learn to fear the Lord his God, to keep all the words of this law, and theſe ſtatutes, to do them (*a*). Inſtead of making his own will his law, as the abſolute monarchs of the Eaſt generally did, he was to rule according to the law which God had given by Moſes. When, Samuel, therefore told the people the manner, משפט miſhpat, of the king that ſhould reign over them (*b*), deſcribing a moſt arbitrary and tyrannical one, who would take their ſons, and appoint them for himſelf, for his chariots, &c. we muſt not underſtand him here, as ſome do, to lay down the rightful authority of the king of Iſrael, but only the practice of the arbitrary monarchs around them, (for they had deſired to have a king like the neighbouring nations (*c*),) in order to divert them from ſo injudicious and ill-adviſed a project *. Accordingly משפט miſhpat, is better rendered manner in our engliſh verſion, then jus in the vulgate, and δικαιωμα in the ſeptuagint. In ſome other places the word ſignifies meerly a manner, or cuſtom, without implying any legal right. Thus Joſeph interprets the dream of Pharaoh's butler, that he ſhould again deliver the cup into his ſovereign's hand, after the "former manner," when he was in office (*d*). Again, David is ſaid to have deſtroyed all the inhabitants of the places on which he made inroads, while he was with Achiſh

(*a*) Deut. xvii. 19. (*b*) 1 Sam. viii. 11. (*c*) ver. 5.

* This is the opinion of Abarbanel, who quotes with approbation the following deciſion of rabbi Jehuda, "Iſta (de jure & judicio regis) non fuerunt dicta, niſi ad eos perterrefaciendos." Ubi ſupra, p. 446.

(*d*) Gen. xl. 13.

Achish king of Gath, lest any of them should report, so did David, and so will be "his manner" all the time that he dwelleth in the country of the Philistines (a). Nay the word is used even for a very corrupt and illegal custom. And "the priests custom with the people was," as the expression is in relation to a very unjustifiable practise of Eli's sons (b).

That the king was bound by law, appears from the story of Ahab, who desired to purchase Naboth's vineyard; yet because the law forbad the alienation of lands from one tribe or family to another, he could not obtain it, till he had got Naboth condemned and executed for blasphemy and treason: whereupon his estate became forfeited to the crown, or the king, however, seized it (c). From hence it appears, that the hebrew monarch was only God's viceroy or lieutenant, governing in all respects by his laws, which he could not alter, under pretext of amending or improving, nor abrogate or repeal on account of any pretended or apprehended inconvenience arising from them; and in matters of importance, when the law was not clear and certain, he was not to enact and determine by his own authority, but to consult the oracle, or God himself.

8thly, The king is charged to be humble, and to govern his subjects with lenity and kindness, not as slaves, but as brethren (d). Thus David, addressing himself to his subjects, stiles them his brethren, as well as his people (e). The first christian emperors imitated this example

(a) 1 Sam. xxvii. 11. (b) 1 Sam. ii. 13. (c) 1 Kings xxi. 1,—16. (d) Deut. xvii. 20. (e) 1 Chron. xxviii. 2.

ample of the hebrew kings; particularly Conſtantine the great, who in his epiſtle to the people of Antioch ſtiles them, his brethren whom he was bound to love *. And he concludes his letter to Euſebius with theſe words, ὁ θεὸς σε διαφυλάξοι, ἀδελφὲ ἀγαπητὲ, may God preſerve you, beloved brother †. Other inſtances of the like ſort may be found in Euſebius's eccleſiaſtical hiſtory ‡; and in his life of Conſtantine §.

Having conſidered the form of the kingly government, we proceed to the rites of inauguration, by which the perſon whom God had appointed to that office, was actually inveſted with the royal dignity.

Firſt, he was anointed. Godwin, following the talmudical rabbies ‖, aſſerts, that all kings were not anointed; but thoſe only in whom the ſucceſſion was broken; and then the firſt of the family was anointed for his ſucceſſors, except in caſes of diſſention, when there was required a renewed unction, for the confirmation of his authority. They ſay therefore, Solomon, as well as his father David, was anointed (*a*) becauſe of the diſpute betwixt Adonijah and him, concerning the ſucceſſion to the crown; and likewiſe

* Euſeb. de vit. Conſtant. lib. iii. cap. 60.
† Ibid. cap. 61.
‡ Lib. x. cap. 5 & 7.
§ Lib. ii. cap. 46. & lib. iii. cap. 20.
‖ Maimon. de regibus, cap. 1. §. x, xii. & comment. in Miſhn. tit. Cherithoth, cap. 1. & Bartenor. in eundem loc. tom. 5. p. 237. edit. Surenhuſ. See teſtimonies out of the Talmud and other authors in Selden de Succeſſ. in Pontificat. lib. ii. cap. ix. apud opera, vol. 2. tom. 3. p. 192, 193.
(*a*) 1 Kings i 39.

likewiſe Joaſh the ſon of Ahaziah (*a*), becauſe the ſucceſſion had been interrupted by Athaliah's uſurpation. But this opinion has no ſufficient foundation in the ſacred hiſtory; on the contrary it ſeems more probable, that all kings were anointed; becauſe king, and the anointed, ſeem in the following paſſages to be ſynonimous terms: "He ſhall give ſtrength unto his king, and exalt the horn of his anointed (*b*):" and again, "David ſaid unto him," that is, to the Amalekite who informed him that he had killed Saul, "how waſt thou not afraid to ſtretch forth thy hand to deſtroy the Lord's anointed (*c*)?" And in his lamentation on this occaſion he hath theſe expreſſions, "The ſhield of the mighty is vilely caſt away, the ſhield of Saul, as though he had not been anointed with oil (*d*)." Theſe laſt words loſe in a manner all their emphaſis, ſuppoſing that no kings were anointed, except the firſt of a family, or only in caſe the right of ſucceſſion to the crown was uncertain. Nay, it ſhould ſeem from this paſſage, that thoſe kings whoſe right of ſucceſſion was doubtful, which had occaſioned their being anointed, were on this ſuppoſition more ſacred than others. Further, we read that Jehoahaz, the ſon of Joſiah, when he was made king in his father's ſtead, was anointed (*e*), though there does not appear to have been any doubt, or diſpute, about the ſucceſſion.

The hebrew doctors repreſent it to be the peculiar privilege of the kings of the family of David, to be anointed with the ſame holy oil, which

(*a*) 2 Kings xi. 12. (*b*) 1 Sam. ii. 10. (*c*) 2 Sam. i. 14. (*d*) ver. 21. (*e*) 2 Kings xxiii. 30.

which was uſed in the conſecration of the high-prieſt; and tells us, that the kings of the ten tribes were anointed with common oil *. But this opinion is hardly to be reconciled to a paſſage in the book of Exodus, where the uſe of the holy oil is appropriated to the conſecration of Aaron and his ſons, and the anointing any other perſon with it is expreſsly prohibited (*a*). They pretend that a diſpenſation for the uſe of the holy oil, to anoint the kings, was afterward revealed to ſome prophet; but of this they produce no ſort of evidence. It appears, indeed, that the oil with which Solomon was anointed, was taken out of the tabernacle (*b*). But that might as well be common oil, a conſiderable quantity of which was kept there for the uſe of the lamps, and which Zadoc the prieſt might have readier at hand on this occaſion than any other. However the following paſſage in the Pſalms is alledged in favour of the opinion, that kings were anointed with the holy oil; "I have found David my ſervant, with my holy oil have I anointed him (*c*)." But, as the perſon, there ſpoken of under the name of David †, undoubtedly means Chriſt, to whom alone a great part of what is ſaid in that context will agree; therefore by the holy oil muſt be underſtood the influence of the divine ſpirit, which was "given to him without meaſure

* Talmud. Cherithoth, cap. 3. vid. Hottinger. de jure Hebræor. leg. cix. p. 138. See alſo Schickard de jure regio, cap. 1. theor. iv. §. 29. p. 78, 79 edit. Carpzov. Lipſiæ, 1674.

(*a*) Exod. xxx. 31, 32. (*b*) 1 Kings i. 39. (*c*) Pſal. lxxxix. 20.

† It ought conſtantly to be remembered here, that David in the Hebrew ſignifies a perſon beloved, which eminently agrees to the Meſſiah.

ſure (*a*)." And even if we ſuppoſe here is an alluſion to the anointing of David, the jewiſh king; yet the oil uſed on the occaſion, might poſſibly be ſtiled holy, not becauſe it was of that peculiar compoſition preſcribed in the thirtieth chapter of Exodus, but becauſe it was typical of the influence of the holy Spirit.

We read of two different ſorts of veſſels, in which the oil wherewith kings were anointed, was contained; the one called פך pack, which we tranſlate a vial (*b*); the other called קרן keren, a horn (*c*). Concerning the difference betwixt theſe two veſſels there are various conjectures. Some make it to lie in the matter of which they were formed; apprehending the פך pack, was made of metal, either gold or ſilver; and the קרן keren, of horn. Others place the difference in the ſhape; and tell us that the קרן keren, was like an horn, and the פך, like a bottle. Others conceive the difference lay in the capacity of the veſſels, and that the קרן keren, contained a larger, the פך pack, a ſmaller quantity. The rabbies make the anointing with the oil out of one or the other of theſe veſſels, to be ominous of a longer or ſhorter reign. Accordingly they tell us that Saul and Jehu were anointed out of the פך pack (*d*), to denote the ſhortneſs of their reigns; but David and Solomon out of the קרן keren

(*a*) John iii. 34.

(*b*) 1 Sam. x. 1.

(*c*) 1 Kings i. 39.

(*d*) 1 Sam. x. 1. 2 Kings ix. 3. in the former of which texts pack is rendered in our engliſh verſion, a vial; in the latter, a box.

ren (*a*), to denote the long ſucceſſion of David's family *. But theſe are meer conjectures.

It is further enquired, whoſe office and proper buſineſs it was to anoint the king? ſince we read of the ceremony's being performed by prophets, and by prieſts:—by prophets; as by Samuel, who anointed Saul, and David; and by one of the ſons of the prophets, who was ſent by Eliſha to anoint Jehu (*b*):—by prieſts, as by Zadoc at the inauguration of Solomon, and by Jehoiada at the coronation of Joaſh (*c*). Here ſome diſtinguiſh between private and publick anointing; the former, they ſuppoſe, was before the inauguration, and betokened the perſon's advancement to the throne ſometime afterwards, which, they ſay, was performed by a prophet. The latter was at the time of the inauguration; and this, they ſay, was performed by the prieſt; as in the caſe of Solomon and Joaſh †.

As to the manner of performing this ceremony, all the account we have in ſcripture is, that the oil was poured upon the head. When Samuel anointed Saul, he "took a vial of oil, and poured it on his head (*d*)." And when the prophet anointed Jehu, it is ſaid, he poured the oil on his head (*e*). From hence it ſeems probable, that the kings were anointed in the ſame plentiful manner, as the prieſts were at their conſecration; the ointment, or oil, was poured upon the head in ſuch a quantity, as to

(*a*) 1 Sam. xvi. 13. and 1 Kings i. 39.

* R. David Kimchi in 2 Reg. ix. See Schickard de jure regio, cap. 1. theor. iv. p. 79. Gemara tit. Cherithoth. See Carpzov. not. (m) in loc. Schickard. jam citat.

(*b*) 2 Kings ix. at the beginning. (*c*) 2 Kings xi. 12.

† Vid. Scacchi Myrothecium iii. cap. xlix. l. p. 1060. & ſeq. edit. Amſtel. 1701.

(*d*) 1 Sam. x. 1. (*e*) 2 Kings ix. 6.

run down upon the beard; and even to the ſkirts, or rather the collar, of the garment; for ſo על־פי מדותו gnal-pi middothaiv, means in the following paſſage of the Pſalmiſt, "It" (that is, brethren's dwelling together in unity) "is like the precious ointment upon the head, that ran down upon the beard, even Aaron's beard, that went down, gnal-pi middothaiv, to the ſkirts, or the collar, of his garments (*a*)." pi ſignifying the hole in the midſt of the robe of the Ephod through which the head was put, and which was bound about, that it might not be rent (*b*). The jewiſh doctors, however, inform us of a difference betwixt the manner of anointing a king, and a prieſt; that the prieſt was anointed in the form of a Greek Chi, or St. Andrew's croſs; and the king, in the form of a circle round his head *; and likewiſe, that the king muſt be anointed in the open air, and near a fountain; which they ground upon the hiſtory of Solomon's being brought to Gihon, which was a fountain, or brook, near Jeruſalem, and there anointed by Zadoc (*c*) †. But from that particular circumſtance in Solomon's inauguration, I ſee no reaſon to conclude it to have been a law for all ſucceeding kings to be anointed at fountains. The Talmudiſts indeed find

(*a*) Pſal. cxxxiii. 2. (*b*) Exod. xxxix. 22, 23.

* Obadias de Bartenora, & Maimon. in Miſhn. tit. Cherithoth, cap. 1. tom. 5. p. 237. edit. Surenhus. See paſſages of other authors in Selden de Succeſs. in Pontificat. lib. ii. cap. ix. apud opera, vol. 2. tom. 3. p. 193,—195.

(*c*) 1 Kings i. 38.

† Vid. Maimon. de regibus, cap. 1. §. xi. and a remarkable paſſage out of the Jeruſalem and Babyloniſh Talmud, apud Schickard. jus regium Hebræor. &, Carpzovii notas, p. 71, 72. edit. Lipſ. 1674.

find a myſtery in the king's being anointed by a fountain, as if it were intended to ſignify the deſired perpetuity of his kingdom, or that it might continue like a fountain, which runs perpetually, and is never dry *.

We have only one remark more to make on this head; and that is, that the cuſtom of conſecrating of any thing to God by a profuſion of oil upon it, appears to have been very ancient, from the inſtance of Jacob's anointing the pillar at Beth-el (*a*). But when it began, and how it was firſt introduced, we cannot ſo much as gueſs, any further, then that probably, it was by a divine inſtitution. We find it in uſe, through the whole moſaick diſpenſation, in the dedication both of men and things to the immediate ſervice of God. It was deſigned as emblematical of the gifts and graces of the ſpirit of God, which are therefore expreſſed by unction in the New Teſtament (*b*). And as Chriſt excelled all others in theſe gifts and graces, he was eminently called משיח Maſſiach, or MESSIAS, from משח Maſhach, to anoint. Which title is alſo given, in a lower ſenſe, to the prieſts (*c*), and alſo to the kings of Iſrael (*d*).

We proceed now to the ſecond ceremony at the inauguration of a king, which was crowning him. There is a reference to it in theſe words of the Pſalmiſt, "Thou preventeſt him, (that is, the king) with the bleſſings of goodneſs, Thou ſetteſt a crown of pure gold on his head (*e*)."

* The Talmud referred to above; and Ralbag and Abarbanel in 1 Kings i. 33. with other rabbiniçal commentators, apud Carpzov. notas, ubi ſupra.

(*a*) Gen. xxviii. 18. (*b*) 1 John ii. 20, 27. (*c*) Lev. iv. 3. (*d*) 1 Sam. xii. 3, 5. (*e*) Pſal. xxi. 3.

And we read expreſsly of its being performed at the inauguration of king Joaſh (*a*). What the form of the royal crown was we do not pretend to determine; only obſerving, that the word נזר nezer, by which it is expreſſed, being uſed for the high-prieſt's crown (*b*), which was merely a fillet or ribband bound round the head with a plate of gold on the front of it (*c*); it is probable, the royal crown was much of the ſame ſhape, or like the diadem which we ſee on the heads of the ancient roman kings on their medals. It ſeems to have been the cuſtom of the jewiſh kings, as well as thoſe of the neighbouring nations, to wear their crown conſtantly when they were dreſſed. King Saul had his crown on, when he was ſlain in the battle of Gilboa (*d*); and the king of the Ammonites, when he headed his army in war; for when David had reduced Rabbah, the royal city, he took the king's crown from his head, and put it on his own (*e*). From this cuſtom it may reaſonably be inferred, that the ancient crowns were much leſs in ſize and weight, than thoſe which are now uſed by the european kings. Yet the crown of the king of the Ammonites, juſt mentioned, is ſaid to "weigh a talent of gold, with the precious ſtones (*f*)." Now a talent being reckoned to be one hundred and twenty-five pounds, ſuch an enormous load on the head no man can be ſuppoſed to have carried, as a part of his ordinary dreſs. Bochart apprehends with great probability, that the word משקל miſhkal, denotes,

(*a*) 2 Kings xi. 12. (*b*) Exod xxix. 6. (*c*) Exod. xxviii. 36, 37. (*d*) 2 Sam. i. 10. (*e*) 2 Sam. xii. 30. (*f*) ubi ſupra.

notes, not the weight, but the value of the crown *; for though the verb שקל ſhakal, in the Hebrew, like pendere in the Latin, related originally to weight; by which, before the invention of coins, metals were exchanged in traffick; yet, as we have ſhown in our lectures on medals, this word came afterwards to be applied to the payment of money, when the cuſtom of weighing it was laid aſide. Thus the ſeptuagint renders שקל ſhakal, by τιμαν, eſtimare, in the fifty-fifth chapter of Iſaiah and the ſecond verſe; and accordingly the noun משקל miſhkal, may properly denote, not the weight of the crown, but its value, by reaſon of the jewels that were ſet in it. Our tranſlators, it ſeems, with ſeveral other learned men, ſuppoſe an enaloge numeri in the text; it being in the Hebrew ואבן יקרה veeben jokrah, and a precious ſtone. Which however, the Jews interpret more literally, of one jewel only; and this, rabbi Kimchi tells us, was a magnet, by means of which this weighty crown was ſo ſupported in the air as to be no load to the man that wore it. But the conceit, of a magnet's being attracted by the air, is a piece of philoſophy worthy only of a jewiſh rabbi. Joſephus ſays this jewel was a Sardonyx †. Which notion, Bochart conjectures, might ariſe from the ancient Jews playing, in their manner, with the phraſe עטרת מלכם gnatereth malcam, the crown of their king. The word מלכם malcam, having the ſame letters with מלכם milcom, the name of the god of the Ammonites, they made the expreſſion to ſignify

* Hieroz. part. 1. lib. 2. cap. 38.
† Antiq. lib. vii. cap. 7. in fine. edit. Haverc.

nisy the crown of that god, who is otherwise called Moloch; and Moloch it seems, or Molocas, is the eastern name of the Sardonyx; for Epiphanius * speaking of the Sardius adds, ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλος (λίθος) Σαρδόνυξ, ὃς καλεῖται Μολοχίτης †.

The third ceremony at the inauguration of a king was the kiss of homage, which the Jews call the kiss of majesty. With respect to Saul we are informed, that "Samuel took a vial of oil, and poured it on his head, and kissed him (*a*)." This ceremony is probably alluded to in the following passage of the Psalmist, "Kiss the son, lest he be angry, &c (*b*)." that is, acknowledge him as your king, pay him homage, and yield him subjection.

Fourthly, The acclamations of the people attended the ceremony of inauguration. Thus in the case of Saul, we are informed, that "all the people shouted and said, God save the king (*c*)." And when Zadock anointed Solomon, "they blew the trumpet and said, God save king Solomon (*d*)."

It may be proper also to mention, under this head, the royal robes, which, probably, were put on the king at his coronation. These, no doubt, were very rich and splendid, as may be concluded from our Saviour's declaring, in order to set forth the beauty which God had imparted to the lilies of the field, that "even Solomon in all his glory, was not arrayed like one of these (*e*)." This allusion is the more appo-

site,

* De duodecim gemmis in veste Aaronis, cap. 1. apud opera, tom. 2. p. 225, 226. edit. Petav. Colon. 1682.

† See Bochart. Hieroz. part. 2. lib. 5. cap. 7.

(*a*) 1 Sam. x. 1. (*b*) Psal. ii. 12. (*c*) 1 Sam. x. 24. (*d*) 1 Kings i. 39. (*e*) Matt. vi. 29.

ſite, if as Joſephus ſaith, Solomon was uſually clothed in white *. And on this ſuppoſition, it is probable, this was the colour of the royal robes of his ſucceſſors. But it being likewiſe the colour of the prieſts garments, the difference betwixt them muſt be ſuppoſed to lie in the richneſs of the ſtuff they were made of. Upon this notion, that the ancient jewiſh kings wore white garments, the rabbies call perſons of diſtinguiſhed birth and high rank חורים chorim, albati, in oppoſition to thoſe of obſcure birth and mean condition, whom they call חשוכים chaſhuchim, tenebroſi, obſcuri. To this diſtinction St. James is ſuppoſed to allude (*a*), when he ſaith, if there come into your aſſembly a man ἐν ἐσθῆτι λαμπρᾷ, which ſome render in a white garment; and a poor man ἐν ἐσθῆτι ῥυπαρᾷ, in a dark or dirty one. This criticiſm, however, wants a better ſupport, than the opinion of Joſephus and the rabbies concerning the colour of the robes of the jewiſh kings; it being certain that the word λαμπρος is applied by the greek writers to any gay colour. Thus Plutarch ſaith †, that weak eyes are offended πρὸς ἅπαν τὸ λαμπρὸν. And Xenophon applies the word to ſuch as are clothed in purple, or who are adorned with bracelets and jewels, and ſplendidly dreſſed ‡. In the book of the Revelation λαμπρος is uſed to ſignify the brightneſs or ſplendor of the morning ſtar (*b*); and likewiſe in general, ſuch things as are pleaſant

* Antiq. lib. viii. cap. vii. §. 3. tom. 1. p. 440. edit. Havercamp.

(*a*) James ii. 2.

† citat. à Stephano.

‡ Cyropæd. lib 2. p. 115, & 117. edit. Hutch. 1738.

(*b*) Rev xxii. 16.

ſant and agreeable to the ſight. Thus in the prophetic doom of the great city Babylon it is ſaid, "all things which were dainty and goodly, τα λιπαρα, και τα λαμπρα, are departed from thee (a);" that is, the things, which St. John elſewhere expreſſes by "the luſt of the fleſh, and the luſt of the eyes (b)." Our author's conjecture, therefore, that the roman ſoldiers putting a purple, and Herod a white, garment on Chriſt, when in deriſion they clothed him as a king, was in conformity to the cuſtoms of their reſpective countries; is very pretty and ingenious, but not ſufficiently ſupported; it being far from certain, that white was the royal colour amongſt the Jews. Something, however, concerning the ceremonies uſed at the inauguration of their kings, in the latter ages of their polity, may be conjectured with probability from the mock ceremonies, which were paid to our bleſſed Saviour (c).

It may not be improper to add a few words concerning the ſtate and grandeur of the jewiſh monarchs: which conſiſted, partly, in the profound reſpect that was paid them; of which we have many inſtances in their hiſtory; and, partly, in their attendants and guards; particularly the Cherethites and Pelethites, of whom we have frequent mention in the hiſtories of David and Solomon. That they were ſoldiers, appears from their making part of David's army, when he marched out of Jeruſalem on occaſion of Abſalom's conſpiracy (d); and likewiſe when they were ſent againſt the rebel, Sheba the ſon of Bichri (e). That they were a diſtinct

(a) Rev. xviii. 14. (b) 1 John ii. 16.
(c) See Matt. xxvii. 29.
(d) 2 Sam. xv. 18. (e) chap. xx. 7.

diſtinct corps from the common ſoldiers, is evident from their having a peculiar commander, and not being under Joab the general of the army (*a*). They ſeem, therefore, to have been the king's body-guard like the Prætorian band among the Romans. The Cherethites were originally Philiſtines (*b*), who were ſkilful archers; and it is therefore, ſuppoſed, that after the Iſraelites had ſuffered ſo much by the Philiſtine archers at the fatal battle of Gilboa (*c*), David, not only took care to have his people inſtructed in the uſe of the bow (*d*), but having made peace with the Philiſtines, hired a body of theſe archers, (it may be with a view of inſtructing his own people,) and made them his guards. With theſe were joined the Pelethites; who are ſuppoſed to have been native Iſraelites, for we find two of the name of Peleth among the jewiſh families; one of the tribe of Reuben (*e*), another of the tribe of Judah (*f*). The Chaldee paraphraſe every where calls the Cherethites and Pelethites, archers and ſlingers. Their number may probably be gathered from the targets and ſhields of gold, which Solomon made for his guards; which were five hundred (*g*).

As an article of the ſtate and magnificence of the jewiſh kings, it may be proper to mention Solomon's royal throne, which was raiſed on

(*a*) 2 Sam. viii. 16, 18.

(*b*) See 1 Sam. xxx. 14, & 16. compared, and Zeph. ii. 5.

(*c*) 1 Sam. xxxi. 3. (*d*) 2 Sam. i. 18. (*e*) Numb. xvi. 1. (*f*) 1 Chron. ii. 33.

(*g*) See 1 Kings x. 16, 17. compared with 2 Chron. xii. 9,—11.

on ſix ſteps, adorned with the images of lions, and overlaid with ivory and gold (*a*).

The laſt honours paid the king, were at his death. It is ſaid, the royal corpſe was carried by nobles to the Sepulchre, though it were at a very conſiderable diſtance *. However this be, we read of publick mourning obſerved for good kings (*b*). Yet, notwithſtanding this royal ſtate and grandeur, they were only God's vice-roys, bound to govern according to the ſtatute law of the land, which they, as well as their ſubjects, were required to obey. The rabbies tell us, that their violation of ſome laws was puniſhed with whipping by order of the Sanhedrim. An account, which is ſo utterly improbable, eſpecially as not a ſingle inſtance can be produced of this puniſhment being inflicted, that it would not deſerve to be mentioned, were it not eſpouſed by ſuch learned men as Selden †, Schickard ‡, and Grotius §. Beſides what hath been obſerved againſt this notion by Leuſden ‖ and

(*a*) 1 Kings x. 18,—20.

* Schickard. jus regium, cap. vi. theor. xix. p. 415,—417. edit. Carpzov. Lipſiæ, 1674.

(*b*) 2 Chron. xxxv. 24. See alſo Jerem. xxii. 18. and xxxiv. 5.

† Selden. de Synedr. lib. ii. cap. ix. §. v. apud opera, vol. 1. tom. 2. p. 1437. though afterwards, having recited the arguments on both ſides, he expreſſeth himſelf more doubtfully, lib. iii. cap. ix. §. v. in fine.

‡ Schickard. de jure regio. cap. ii. theor. vii. p. 141. 142. edit. Carpzov.

§ Grot. de jure belii & pacis, lib. 1. cap. iii. §. xx. 2. p. 79, 80. edit. Gronov. Hagæ com. 1680. To account for this flagellation, he ſuppoſes it was not inflicted on the king by any others, as a puniſhment; but was a voluntary infliction of his own, as a token of his penitence. But this is not agreeable to the repreſentation given by the hebrew doctors.

‖ Leuſden. Philolog. Hebræo-mixt. diſſert. xxv. §. x. p. 167,—169. edit. ſecund. Ultraject. 1682.

and Carpzovius *, I apprehend, I have rendered it at leaſt probable, that the Sanhedrim to whom the rabbies aſcribe ſuch extraordinary powers, did not exiſt till the time of the Maccabees.

* Not. ad Schickard. loc. ſupra citat;

CHAP. V.

Of the High-Prieſts, Prieſts, Levites and Nethinims.

WITH reſpect to the prieſts, we propoſe to enquire

1ſt, What ſort of officers in the hebrew commonwealth they were: And

2dly, To whom it appertained to execute that office.

1ſt, Our firſt enquiry is, what ſort of officers the prieſts were, who are called in the Hebrew כֹּהֲנִים cohanim. The reaſon of this enquiry is, becauſe we find in ſcripture the title cohanim applied to the officers of ſtate, as well as to the miniſters of the ſanctuary. Thus, in the ſecond book of Samuel, David's ſons are ſaid to have been cohanim (*a*). That they were not miniſters of the ſanctuary is certain, becauſe they were of the tribe of Judah, not of Levi, to which tribe the eccleſiaſtical miniſtry was by the law expreſsly limited. Their being called cohanim, therefore, can mean no other than as our tranſlators render the word, chief rulers, or

(*a*) 2 Sam. viii. 18.

or principal officers of ſtate. And ſo indeed this title ſeems to be explained in the parallel place in Chronicles, where the ſons of David are ſaid to have been הראשנים ליד המלך hariſhonim lejadh hammelek, primi ad manum regis, "chief about the king (*a*)." Thus alſo Ira, the Jairite, is called כהן לדויד cohèn le-David, which our tranſlators render, "chief ruler about David (*b*)." But more commonly the title, cohanim, is given to the miniſter of the ſanctuary, who offered ſacrifices, and other ways officiated in the publick worſhip. Hence ariſes that uncertainty, whether Potipherah and Jethro, the former the father-in-law of Joſeph, the latter of Moſes, were eccleſiaſtical or civil perſons; which our tranſlators have expreſſed by calling them prieſts in the text, and prince in the margin (*c*). The true reaſon of the different application of the word, cohanim, ſeems to be, that in the primary ſenſe it imports thoſe that miniſter to a king. They who were ליד המלך lejadh hammelek, about the king, or his miniſters, were called his כהנים cohanim. And therefore, as God is a king, he had his cohanim as well as earthly monarchs, or ſuch as attended on his ſpecial preſence in the ſanctuary, and miniſtred in the ſacred ſervice. Accordingly, having taken upon himſelf the character of the king of Iſrael, he commanded Moſes to conſecrate Aaron and his ſons לכהן לי lecohèn li (*d*), to be his cohanim. Accordingly God's cohanim are ſaid to come near unto the Lord (*e*), as the miniſters of ſtate come near to a king, and attend in his preſence.

It

(*a*) 1 Chron. xviii. 17. (*b*) 2 Sam. xx. 26.
(*c*) Gen. xli. 45. Exod. ii. 16. (*d*) Exod. xxx. 30.
(*e*) Exod. xix. 22. Numb. xvi. 5.

It has been made a queſtion, in which ſenſe we are to underſtand the word כהן cohèn, in the following paſſage of the Pſalmiſt, "Thou art a prieſt for ever after the order of Melchizedek (*a*)." Many of the later rabbies, who think David is the perſon there ſpoken of, underſtand by כהן cohèn, a king, in the civil and political, ſince it is certain David was not a cohèn in the eccleſiaſtical ſenſe *. But in this they are undoubtedly miſtaken; for not only is it certain from ſeveral quotations, in the New Teſtament, of the Pſalm, wherein this paſſage is contained, that it relates to Chriſt †; but the word cohèn is no where uſed to ſignify a king, but always one that miniſters to a king. Melchizedek, it is true, was a king in Salem; nevertheleſs it was on account of another office, which he executed, that he is called a cohèn (*b*); namely, as he miniſtred, in ſacris, or in the ſolemnities of divine worſhip. He was a king over men, but at the ſame time a cohèn to the moſt high God. Of theſe ſacred, or eccleſiaſtical, cohamin, we propoſe to diſcourſe, and proceed to enquire,

2dly, To whom it appertained to execute the office of an eccleſiaſtical cohèn, or prieſt, eſpecially in offering ſacrifices.

In order to reſolve this queſtion, it will be neceſſary to diſtinguiſh the ſacred rites into private, domeſtick and publick. It is ſuppoſed, that in the moſt ancient times every private perſon was allowed to offer ſacrifices for himſelf.

(*a*) Pſal. cx. 4.

* R. David Kimchi in loc.

† And ſo it is underſtood by the ancient rabbies. See Owen on the Hebrews, vol. 1. exercitat. ix. §. 26.

(*b*) Gen. xiv. 18.

ſelf. When Cain and Abel brought each of them, an offering to the Lord, there is no mention of any prieſt officiating for them, though it does not appear, that either of them ſuſtained any publick character, or had been conſecrated to the ſacerdotal office (*a*). The Talmudiſts, indeed, are of opinion, that they brought their ſacrifices to Adam, that he might offer them on their behalf, but of this there is not the leaſt hint in the ſacred hiſtory *. When a ſacrifice was offered, or other ſacred rites were performed, for a family, it ſeems to have been done by the head of it; thus Noah ſacrificed for himſelf, and family (*b*); and likewiſe Jacob (*c*). Job "offered burnt offerings for his daughters, and his ſons, according to the number of them all (*d*)." It has been commonly ſuppoſed, rather than proved, that the prieſts office was hereditary in every family, deſcending from the father to the eldeſt ſon. When, in proceſs of time, ſeveral families were combined into nations and bodies politick, the king, as head of the community, officiated as prieſt for the whole. Thus Melchizedek was both king and prieſt in Salem; and Moſes, as king in Jeſhurun, (which is another name for Iſrael) officiated as prieſt, in the ſolemn national ſacrifice offered on occaſion of Iſrael's entering into covenant with God at Horeb. Moſes ſprinkled the blood of the ſacrifice upon the altar, and upon the people (*e*).

Indeed the ſacrifices are ſaid to have been offered by "young men of the children of Iſrael, whom Moſes ſent or appointed (*f*);" that is, ſays the

(*a*) See Gen. iv. * Vid. Heidegger. hiſtor. Patriarch. tom. 1. exercitat. v. p. 177. (*b*) Gen. viii. 20. (*c*) Gen. xxxv. 3. (*d*) Job i. 5. (*e*) Exod. xxiv. 6, & 8. (*f*) ver. 5.

Targum of Onkelos, by the firſt born of the ſons of Iſrael, who were the prieſts and ſacrificers, till the Levites, being appointed inſtead of them, had the prieſthood ſettled in their tribe. The Arabick and Perſic verſions favour this opinion. However, it is to be obſerved, that נערים nangnarim, which we render young men, does not always ſignify thoſe who are young in years, but thoſe who are fit for ſervice; and accordingly it is applied to miniſters or ſervants of any kind (*a*). There is no neceſſity, therefore, that we ſhould underſtand by the נערים nangnarim, whom Moſes ſent to offer burnt offerings, and to ſacrifice peace offerings, proper prieſts, conſecrated to that office; for they might be only ſervants, employed to kill and prepare the ſacrifices, while he, as prieſt, ſprinkled the blood of them on the altar, and on the people. Moſes is therefore, by the Pſalmiſt, called a prieſt: "Moſes and Aaron among his prieſts (*b*)."

But when God made a more perfect ſettlement of their conſtitution, and gave them his law at Sinai, he alloted the public ſacerdotal office to Aaron and his ſons, and entailed it on their poſterity; and though the whole tribe of Levi, to which Aaron belonged, was appointed to the ſervice of the ſanctuary, namely to perform the lower offices relating to the publick worſhip, yet it was now made a capital crime for any, beſides Aaron, and his ſons and deſcendants, to officiate, as prieſts, in the more ſolemn acts of offering ſacrifices, burning incenſe, and bleſſing the people. Inſomuch that when

(*a*) Gen. xiv. 24. xxii. 3. 2 Sam. xviii. 25. 1 Kings xx. 14. (*b*) Pſal. xcix. 6.

when Corah and his companions (though Corah was of the tribe of Levi,) attempted to invade the prieſts office (*a*), God executed his vengeance upon them in a very remarkable manner, as a warning to all others (*b*), and confirmed the prieſthood anew to Aaron and his family by the miraculous ſign of the budding of his rod (*c*). It was, now, no more lawful for the king, than for the meaneſt of the people, to officiate in the prieſts office. This is evident from the remonſtrance, which Azariah and his companions made to king Uzziah, when he "went into the temple of the Lord, to burn incenſe upon the altar of incenſe," (perhaps out of a vain ambition of imitating the heathen kings, who in many places executed the prieſthood, and that he might in all reſpects appear as great as they); and from the judgment which God inflicted upon him for it (*d*).

Here a conſiderable difficulty ariſes, in that after the giving of the law, (by which the prieſthood was limited to Aaron's family,) we have an account of ſeveral kings, judges, and prophets taking upon them to officiate as prieſts, ſacrificing and bleſſing the people, who yet were not of the family of Aaron, nor of the tribe of Levi, without any cenſure paſſed upon them; nay, it ſhould ſeem, with the divine approbation. Samuel, who was of the tribe of Ephraim, was waited for, that, according to his cuſtom, he might bleſs the ſacrifice (*e*). And on another occaſion, he "offered a lamb for a burnt offering to the Lord (*f*)." Both which acts did properly belong to the prieſt.

(*a*) Numb. xvi. 10. (*b*) ver. 31,—33. (*c*) chap. xvii. (*d*) 2 Chron. xxvi. 16, 21. (*e*) 1 Sam. ix. 13. (*f*) 1 Sam. vii. 9.

King Saul offered a burnt offering (*a*); and David offered "burnt offerings, and peace offerings before the Lord, and blessed the people in the name of the Lord of hosts (*b*)." Solomon, likewise, blessed the people, as well as prayed in the publick congregations, at the dedication of the temple (*c*). And the prophet Elijah sacrificed a bullock (*d*).

The common solution of this difficulty is, that these kings and prophets caused the priests to perform the sacrifices for them, and are said to do what was done by their order. But this sense of the expressions, used on these occasions, is too forced to be easily admitted. What Elijah is said to have done, in particular, in the forecited passage, seems evidently to have been done by himself; and cannot, without great force upon the words, be understood of any other person's doing it for him. The difficulty, therefore, is perhaps better solved by supposing, that when these persons acted as priests, they did it not, as being heads of the people, but as being prophets and under the special direction of the spirit of God, who had, no doubt, a right to dispense with his own laws, and sometimes did on extraordinary occasions. Some, on this principle, interpret the words of Samuel to Saul: "The spirit of the Lord shall come upon thee, and thou shalt prophesy; then do thou as occasion shall serve thee, for God is with thee (*e*):" that is, according to them, when thou art thus endowed with the spirit, thou mayest follow his directions upon all emergencies, without regarding

(*a*) 1 Sam. xiii. 9.
(*b*) 2 Sam. vi. 17, 18.
(*c*) 1 Kings viii. 54.
(*d*) 1 Kings xviii. 30.
(*e*) 1 Sam. x. 6, 7.

garding the letter of the law. Though this will not excuſe his ſacrificing, becauſe from his own account it appears, that he did not do it by ſpecial divine direction, but contrary to his judgment; he "forced himſelf to it, according to his own expreſſion, and did it out of fear (*a*)."

With reſpect to the different orders and ranks of prieſts, and of other miniſters about the jewiſh temple ſervice, Godwin ſaith, they were three, prieſts, Levites, and Nethinims. And he adds, they may be paralleled with miniſters, deacons and ſubdeacons in the primitive church; and over them the high-prieſt was chief. In this manner the papiſts pretend to found their eccleſiaſtical hierarchy on the jewiſh eſtabliſhment; comparing the pope with the high-prieſt, the clergy with the prieſts, the lay monks and cathedral officers, ſuch as their ſinging men and boys, &c. with the Levites and Nethinims. But the author has not produced, from the New Teſtament, his evidence of ſuch a diſtinction of miniſters in the primitive chriſtian church as he here ſpeaks of. There we have not the leaſt intimation of two ſorts of deacons, the one preachers, the other not; but only of one ſort, whoſe province was to take care of the poor, and of the other temporal matters relating to the church (*b*). But to return,

The prieſthood was entailed on the poſterity of Aaron in whom the ſucceſſion was continued (*c*); and he having four ſons, Nadab

(*a*) 1 Sam. xiii. 11, 12.

(*b*) See the account of their inſtitution and office, Acts vi. at the beginning.

(*c*) Exod. xxviii. 43. and xxix. 9.

and Abihu, Eleazar and Ithamar (a), they, together with their father, were consecrated to the sacerdotal office. It was not long, before Nadab and Abihu were both struck dead by fire from heaven. The crime, thus severely punished, was their presuming to burn incense in the Tabernacle with other fire, than that which God had commanded to be used (b), and which he ordered to be kept constantly burning on the altar, having been first lighted by a flash from heaven, whereby the first victims that were offered on the altar, after it was erected, had been consumed in the presence of the people (c). As immediately upon this, Aaron and all the priests were forbid to drink wine, or any other intoxicating liquors, when ever they went into the tabernacle, "lest they should die (d);" the Jews with some reason conclude, that the crime of these two priests was their being drunk, when they went to officiate in the tabernacle.

Nadab and Abihu thus dying before their father, and leaving no children (e), there remained Eleazar and Ithamar, in whose posterity the family of Aaron, or of the priests, was distinguished into two branches. Godwin saith, that "the high-priesthood was tied or limited to the line of Aaron's first born," that is, to the line of Eleazar, who immediately succeeded his father in the office of high-priest (f); and was succeeded by his eldest son Phinehas, who had the dignity confirmed to him, and entailed on the line of his posterity, for the pious zeal which he shewed against idolatry and

(a) 1 Chron. vi. 3. (b) Lev. x. 1, 2. (c) Lev. ix. 24. (d) Lev. x. 9. (e) 1 Chron. xxiv. 2. (f) Numb. xx. 26, 28.

and lewdneſs. "Behold I give him my covenant of peace, ſaith God, and he ſhall have it, and his ſeed after him; even the covenant of an everlaſting prieſthood (*a*)." However, this promiſe muſt be underſtood conditionally in caſe the eldeſt branch of his houſe was fit to diſcharge this high office, or did not forfeit the dignity by ſome notorious wickedneſs; for upon any ſuch failure in the line of Phinehas, it was to be transferred to the eldeſt branch of the line of Ithamar. Accordingly we find, there were ſeveral changes from one line to the other, between the death of Aaron and the captivity of Iſrael. It firſt continued through ſeven ſucceſſions in the line of Eleazar, and was then tranſlated to the line of Ithamar, in the perſon of Eli, who was both high-prieſt and judge in Iſrael. That he was of the family of Ithamar, not of Eleazar, is concluded from his name not being inſerted in the genealogy of Eleazar (*b*); and from Joſephus's ſaying, that he was of the family of Ithamar *. Eli, then, was the firſt of that line, who was raiſed to this high dignity; and in his family it continued till the reign of Saul, who cauſed Abimelech the ſon of Ahitub to be ſlain, and probably tranſferred the prieſthood to Zadoc, who was of the Phinehan line; for in David's time, we find Zadoc joined with Abiathar (who had eſcaped the maſſacre of the prieſts of Ithamar's line) in the execution of the high-prieſthood (*c*). It may be preſumed, that Zadoc having been advanced by Saul, and being alſo of the eldeſt line of Aaron's family, David did not

(*a*) Numb. xxv. 12, 13. (*b*) 1 Chron. vi. 3, &c.
* Antiq. lib. v. cap. ult.
(*c*) 2 Sam. xx. 25.

not chuse to depose him, and therefore joined him with Abiathar, whose father and other relations had lost their lives on his account, and whom he had acknowledged as high-priest, and had accordingly enquired of the Lord by him, presently after his father's death (a). And thus Zadoc and Abiathar continued partners in this dignity through the reign of David. It is said, indeed, in the account of this king's principal officers and ministers in the second book of Samuel, that "Zadoc the son of Ahitub and Ahimeleck the son of Abiathar were the priests (b)." In this passage here are two things which require explanation. The first is, that Ahimeleck is said to be the son of Abiathar, whereas Abiathar was the son of Ahimeleck. But this difficulty is removed by the easy supposition, that Abiathar might have a son, called after his father Ahimeleck.—The second is, that Ahimeleck, instead of his father Abiathar, is joined as priest with Zadoc. The most probable solution of this is, that Abiathar, through indolence or sickness not much attending to the duty of his office, his son Ahimeleck commonly officiated for him; and on that account he, rather than his father, is named with Zadoc, as executing the priest's office. Afterward, when Solomon was fixed on his throne, he degraded Abiathar, for his treason in the conspiracy of Adonijah (c), and put Zadoc in his room (d); that is, established him in the office, alone. And in his line the succession continued till the captivity. But though Abiather was turned out of his office, it seems he

(a) 1 Sam. xxiii. beginning. (b) 2 Sam. viii. 17.
(c) 1 Kings ii. 27. (d) ver. 35.

he was ſtill honoured with the title of high-prieſt, as before; for preſently after we find him named with Zadoc, as in David's time (a). The truth is, he was now reduced to the ſame rank, which the eldeſt branch of the line of Ithamar held, before the tranſlation of the prieſthood to Eli; that is, he was ſecond in the eccleſiaſtical dignity. This probably was the caſe with Zephaniah mentioned by the prophet Jeremy, who ſtiles "Seraiah the chief, and Zephaniah the ſecond prieſt (b);" theſe two being the eldeſt branches of the two lines of Aaron's family.

Many have been the conjectures concerning the reaſon of the firſt tranſlation of the high-prieſthood from Eleazar's to Ithamar's family, in the perſon of Eli. One is, the idolatry, which Micah introduced among the Iſraelites, which the high-prieſt is ſuppoſed to have countenanced and encouraged (c).

To this it may be objected, not only that this idolatry ſeems to have been peculiar to the tribe of Dan, or rather to a ſmall part of that tribe, which ſettled at Laiſh (d); but that, though the hiſtory of this affair is placed near the end of the book of Judges, it is generally thought to have happened ſoon after the death of Joſhua*, before there was "any judge in Iſrael (e);" that is, at leaſt three hundred years before

(a) 1 Kings iv. 4. (b) Jer. lii. 24.
(c) See Judg. xviii.
(d) ver. 28.—30.
* Joſephus ſeems to have been of this opinion, concerning the early date of Micah's idolatry; for he places the ſtory of the Levite related in the next chapter, ſoon after the death of Joſhua. Antiq. lib. v. cap. 2.
(e) See ver. 1. and likewiſe above, book 1. chap. 1. p. 46.

before the translation of the priesthood out of Eleazar's family. And it cannot be supposed that if the degradation of that family had been the punishment of this sin, it would have been so long delayed.

Dr. Lightfoot conjectures, that God's depriving Eleazar's family of the pontifical dignity for several successions, was on account of the ignorance or carelessness of the high-priest, in suffering Jephthah to sacrifice his daughter *; whence you will observe, it was his opinion, he did actually sacrifice her. After all nothing can be advanced here beyond bare conjecture, the scripture no where informing us of the reason for which the line of Eleazar was thus degraded. But, considering how many legal imperfections would disqualify a man for that high dignity, it is no wonder, that the lineal succession was often interrupted, and the second priest, or the head of one line of Aaron's family, placed above the natural successor in the other line. However, it has been generally thought, and with reason, that some enormous crime was the cause of the first translation, from the family of Eleazar to that of Ithamar; partly, because God had by covenant entailed the succession on the Phinehan line, as was observed before: and partly, because the next translation back again, from the line of Ithamar to that of Eleazar, was on account of the sins of Eli's sons. "I chose the house of thy father Aaron," saith God to Eli by the prophet: "to offer up incense and sacrifices upon mine altar. Why then do ye kick at my sacrifices? Therefore, though I said

* Lightfoot's harmony of the Old Testament, on Judg. xi, xii. sub anno Mundi 2819.

ſaid that thine houſe ſhould ſtand before me for ever, now be it far from me. Behold the days come, that thou ſhalt ſee an enemy in thine habitation, and I will raiſe me up a faithful prieſt (a)." By an enemy, or rival, (as ſome would tranſlate the word צר tſar,) may probably be meant the eldeſt branch of the other line, who, though ſet aſide for a time, was to be reinſtated in the ſupreme dignity.

There appear, by the ſcripture account, to have been thirty high-prieſts from Aaron to Jozedeck, who was carried captive into Babylon; yet we cannot be ſure there were no more, ſince the ſcripture no where profeſſes to give us an exact liſt. After the captivity the regularity of ſucceſſion was little regarded. The Jews acknowledge that ſome got into the office by money *; and it is ſaid, that ſome of the high-prieſts deſtroyed one another by witchcraft. Whether we give credit to this account, or not, it ſhews that ſeveral of them, in thoſe latter ages of the jewiſh church, were corrupt and vicious men, and left a very bad character behind them. Some rabbies reckon eighty high-prieſts, from the return from the babyloniſh captivity to the deſtruction of the ſecond temple. Others eighty four, or eighty five †.

We

(a) 1 Sam. ii. 27, &c.

* Vid. Bartenora, & Maimon. in Miſhn. tit. Joma, cap. 1. §. 3. tom. 2. p. 208. edit. Surenhus.

† On the ſucceſſion of the high-prieſts conſult Selden de ſucceſſione in pontificatum. Reland. antiq. hebræ. part. 2. cap. 3. and Prideaux's connect. part 1. book 1. ſub anno 656. ante Chriſtum. Selden's ſecond book de ſucceſſione in pontif. contains a large account out of the rabbies of the enquiries which were made previous to the initiation of the high-prieſt, whether he was next in blood, and born of a marriage allowed by the law, whether he

was

We now proceed to conſider

1ſt, The conſecration of the jewiſh prieſts to their office: and

2dly, The office itſelf, to which they were conſecrated: ſhowing under both heads, in what reſpects the high-prieſt, and the inferior prieſts were alike, and wherein they differed.

In diſcourſing of the conſecration of the high-prieſt, Godwin begins with the anointing of him, as one thing wherein he differed from the inferior prieſts. But the ſcripture mentions his being cloathed with the pontifical garments, as previous to his unction: "The holy garments of Aaron ſhall be his ſons after him, to be anointed therein, and to be conſecrated in them (*a*)." There was ſtill another ceremony, previous both to anointing and cloathing, and common to the high-prieſt and to the inferior prieſts; namely, their being waſhed with water: "Aaron and his ſons thou ſhalt bring unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and ſhalt waſh them with water (*b*)". From hence ſome explain thoſe words of our Saviour to John the baptiſt, when he deſired to be baptized of him: "Thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteouſneſs (*c*);" that is, being about to enter on his prieſtly office, it became him to be baptized, or waſhed, according to the law, which he was ſubject to, or as the apoſtle expreſſes it, "was made under (*d*)." Others think that "fulfilling

was of a proper age, that is, arrived to puberty, whether he had any bodily defect, or was addicted to any vice, which diſqualified him. The like enquiries are ſaid to have been made, mutatis mutandis, concerning the common prieſts, previous to their conſecration.

(*a*) Exod. xxix. 29. (*b*) ver. 4. (*c*) Matt. iii. 15. (*d*) Gal. iv. 4.

filling all righteousness" here means owning and complying with every divine institution, which John's baptism was*. Be this as it will, the ceremonial washing of all the priests was, doubtless, designed to be typical of that purity of heart and life, which is declared to be essential to the ministers of the gospel (a).

We now proceed to consider the unction, which was another ceremony at the consecration of the priests. Godwin represents this anointing, (which term, he seems to think, intimates the profusion of the oil used on the occasion,) as peculiar to the high-priest; whereas the second priests, he saith, were only sprinkled with this oil, mingled with the blood of the sacrifices. But in this he is undoubtedly mistaken; for as the ceremony of sprinkling was common to Aaron and his sons (b), so also was the anointing. Thus the Lord spake unto Moses, "Thou shalt anoint Aaron and his sons, and consecrate them, that they may minister unto me in the priests office (c)." Again, it is said, "These are the names of the sons of Aaron, the priests, who were anointed, whom he consecrated to minister in the priest's office, even Nadab and Abihu; Eleazar and Ithamar (d)." There seems, however, to have been this difference betwixt the high-priest and the common priests, that every high-priest was anointed at his consecration, at least before the captivity; whereas none of the common priests were anointed after the immediate sons of Aaron. Every high-priest, I say, was anointed; only when Eleazar succeeded his father in the

* Witsii Miscell. tom. 2. lib. 2. dissert. 2. §. 47.

(a) 1 Tim. iii. 2, 7, and elsewhere. (b) Lev. viii. 30. (c) Exod. xxx 30. (d) Numb. iii. 3.

then high-priesthood, the ceremony of anointing seems to have been omitted at his consecration, because he had been anointed before, when he was consecrated a common priest. There is no other account therefore of the ceremony of his installment, but his being clothed with his father's pontifical garments (*a*). That the succeeding high-priests were anointed at their consecration, may be certainly inferred from that perpetual law concerning the high-priest, (meaning not only Aaron, but any of his successors in that office,) wherein he is called "the priest that is anointed (*b*)." And this being the distinguishing character of the high-priest, it may likewise be inferred, that the common priests, the successors of Aaron's sons, were not anointed.

Maimonides and the talmudical rabbies speak much of a sacerdos ad bellum unctus, or priest anointed for war, who, they say, was anointed with the same oil that the high-priest was, as being little inferior to him in dignity, though in the sanctuary he ministered only as a common priest, and wore no other garments than they did. His proper office, as they inform us, was to attend the camp in time of war, and encourage the people to the battle, according to the following law: "And it shall be, when ye are come nigh unto the battle, that the priest shall approach, and speak unto the people, and shall say unto them, hear, O Israel, you approach this day unto battle against your enemies: let not your hearts faint, fear not, and do not tremble, neither be ye terrified because

(*a*) Numb. xx. 28. (*b*) Lev. iv. 3. See also ver. 16.

cause of them. For the Lord your God is he that goeth with you, to fight for you against your enemies, to save you (*a*)." Maimonides saith, that when "he who is anointed for the war, standing on a high place, before the whole army, hath pronounced these words in the holy tongue, another priest under him proclaimeth it to all the people with a loud voice. And then the anointed priest saith, What man is there that hath built a new house and hath not dedicated it? let him go and return to his house lest he die in the battle, and another man dedicate it. What man is there, that hath planted a vineyard, and hath not yet eaten of it? let him also go and return unto his house, lest he die in the battle and another man eat of it. What man is there that hath betrothed a wife, and hath not taken her? let him go and return unto his house, lest he die in battle and another man take her (*b*)." Thus much the anointed priest speaketh, and the officer proclaimeth it aloud to the people. Afterward the officer himself speaketh, and saith, "What man is there that is fearful and faint hearted? let him go and return unto his house, lest his brethrens heart faint as well as his heart (*c*)." And another officer proclaims it to the people *. Now though it may be very naturally supposed, that some of the priests attended the camp, as a kind of chaplains to the regiments, and as having some particular service assigned them, which made their presence necessary; namely, to blow with the trumpets (*d*); and to encourage the people; nevertheless that there was one priest peculiarly

(*a*) Deut. xx. 2,—4. (*b*) ver. 5,—7. (*c*) ver. 8.
*. Maimon. de regibus, chap. 7. § 1,—4.
(*d*) Numb. x. 8, 9.

peculiarly consecrated to this service, and of superior dignity to the common priests, does not appear in scripture; and we have therefore no reason to believe, (notwithstanding this rabbinical fiction,) that any priests, after the sons of Aaron, were anointed, but the high-priest only.

The ointment or oil, with which the priest was anointed, is described, and there is a receipt for making it, in the book of Exodus (*a*). It was compounded of spicy drugs, namely, myrrh, sweet cinnamon, sweet calamus and cassia, mixed with oil olive. Maimonides pretends to tell us the manner of making this mixture. "Each of these four spices, saith he, was pounded separately; then they were all mixed together, and a strong decoction of them made with water; which being strained from the ingredients, was boiled up with the oil, till the water was all evaporated *. The rabbies are very positive, that no more of this holy oil was made after that which Moses made, for anointing the tabernacle, and the first set of priests †. And they ground their opinion on the following passage, which they understand as a prohibition of making it in any future time, "This shall be an holy anointing oil unto me throughout your generations. Upon man's flesh it shall not be poured, neither shall ye make

(*a*) Exod. xxx. 23,—25.

* De apparatu templi, cap. 1, §. 2. apud Crenii Fasciculum sextum, p. 84. & seq. Comment. in Mishn. tit. Cherithoth, cap. 1. §. 1. tom. 5. p. 237, 238. edit. Surenhus. Hotting. de legibus Hebræor. §. cvii, cviii. & Schikard. jus regium Hebræor. cum notis Carpzov. theor. iv. p. 63, & seq.

† Vid. Talmud. Cherithoth, cap. 1. & Schikard. jus regium, & Carpzov. not. p. 67,—71.

make any other like it, after the compoſition of it; it is holy and ſhall be holy unto you. Whoſoever compoundeth any like it, or whoſoever putteth any of it upon a ſtranger, ſhall even be cut off from his people (*a*)." But this only means, as Chriſtopher Cartwright juſtly obſerves *, that none of it ſhould be made for any private or profane uſe, not that when it was neceſſary for the holy purpoſes, for which it was appointed, no freſh quantity ſhould ever be made by the original receipt. Indeed I can ſee no reaſon, why a receipt ſhould be given for making it, if no more was to be made after that firſt parcel. Beſides, the quantity made by Moſes with one hin of oil, a meaſure, according to biſhop Cumberland, little more than a wine gallon, could not be much more, than was ſufficient for anointing the tabernacle and all its furniture, the altar and all its veſſels, the laver, and Aaron and his four ſons (*b*). Or if any after all remained, it could not be ſufficient for anointing the ſucceeding high-prieſts for many ages; nor would it keep ſo long, but evaporate and be dried up. The rabbies, indeed, always dextrous at unravelling difficulties, tell us, it was miraculouſly preſerved †, like the pot of Manna in the ark of the covenant; and was multiplied like the widow's cruiſe of oil (*c*). They, however, acknowledge, it was loſt in Joſiah's time, about

(*a*) Exod. xxx. 31,—33.

* Electa targumico-rabbinica in Exod xxx. 33.

(*b*) ver. 26,—30.

† Schickard. ubi ſupra, p. 69. Talmud. Cherithoth. cap. 1. & 3. vid. Hottinger. de juris Hebræor. legibus, leg. cix, cx. p. 138, 139. edit. Tiguri, 1655.

(*c*) 1 Kings xvii. 14.

fifty years before the destruction of the temple, and that after that no more high-priests were anointed *. But if by the "two anointed ones," spoken of by Zechariah, "that stand by the Lord of the whole earth (a)," are meant, (as Kimchi and many others understand that passage) Joshua the high-priest, and Zerubbabel the governor, who acted as king of the Jews, this will be an evidence, that anointing was used even after the captivity. Eusebius is of opinion, that it continued in use till our Saviour's time †.

As to the manner of performing this ceremony, the rabbies relate it with as much particularity and confidence, as if they had been eye witnesses of it. They tell us, indeed, they had the account of it from their wise men, and they had it from the prophets, who had seen it performed. They inform us, that the oil was poured on the top of the priest's head, which was bare, so plentifully, as to run down his face upon his beard to the collar of his robe; and some say, that he, who anointed him, drew on his forehead, with his finger, the figure of the greek Caph, or Kappa, the first letter of the word כהן cohen. Whereas others make it to be the figure of the greek Chi, which some suppose was for the first letter in χρίω ungo, and χριστος unctus; in which they discover a great typical mystery. But all, which can with any certainty be depended upon, is that very brief account given us

* Talmud. Cherithoth, cap. 1. & Maimon. de apparatu templi, cap. 1. §. 8. Vid. Schickard ubi supra, p. 69, 70.

(a) Zech. iv. 14. † Euseb. demonst. evang. lib. viii. p. 387. edit. Paris. 1628. ‡ Vid. DeBartenora & Maimonidem in Mishn. tit. Cherithoth, cap. 1. §. 1. & Selden. de Success. in Pontificat. lib. ii. cap. ix.

us in Leviticus: "And Moses poured the anointing oil, upon Aaron's head (*a*):" And by the Psalmist, when he compares brotherly love and unity to "the precious ointment on the head, that ran down upon Aaron's beard, that went down to the skirts, or the collar, of his garments (*b*)." Some suppose, that, at the consecration of the high-priest, this unction was repeated seven days together; an opinion, which they ground upon a passage in the book of Exodus, where, that "son of Aaron, who is priest in his stead," that is, high-priest, is injoined, "when he cometh into the tabernacle of the congregation, in order to minister in the holy place, to wear those garments, in which he was anointed and consecrated, seven days (*c*)." But it does not follow, that, therefore he was to be anointed seven times over.

The high-priest being represented in the New Testament as a type of Christ, Godwin very reasonably, supposes his unction to be typical of those extraordinary gifts and influences of the Spirit, with which the human nature of our Lord was endowed; and which, in allusion to this type are expressed by anointing him: "God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows (*d*)." It is observed, that this spiritual unction of Christ was not performed at once, but at three different times, each effusion being more plentiful than the former. The first was at his birth, and in his minority; and it appeared in the extraordinay wisdom, which he discovered at twelve years old; insomuch that when at that early age,

(*a*) Lev. viii. 12. (*b*) Psal. cxxxiii. 2. (*c*) Exod. xxix. 29, 30. (*d*) Psal. xlv. 7.

he taught in the temple among the scribes and doctors, "all who heard him were astonished at his understanding and answers (*a*)." The second was at his baptism; when the spirit of God descended like a dove, and lighted upon him (*b*). The third, and most compleat, was upon his ascension, when he "received of the father the promise of the holy ghost, which he shed forth upon his disciples (*c*)." The prophecy of the Psalmist, contained in the forty-fifth Psalm, to which I referred above, relates, I apprehend, not so much to the two former unctions, which were designed to qualify him for his ministry on earth, as to that which he received after his ascension, in reward of his humiliation and obedience.

The second part of the ceremony of consecration was enrobing the priests with the sacerdotal vestments. These were eight; four common to the high-priests and inferior priests, and four peculiar to the high-priests. The former were the drawers or breeches, the coat, the girdle, and the bonnet or turbant (*d*). The latter, the robe, the ephod, the breast-plate and the holy crown. All these garments, especially those peculiar to the high-priest, were exceeding rich and sumptuous; the colours gay, and disposed in a beautiful contrast; they were ornamented with rich embroidery, and set off with gold and jewels; and, no doubt, they were very graceful in their shape and form according to the taste of those times. Little, indeed, can be advanced with certainty concerning the fashion of several of these vestments, Moses having

(*a*) Luke ii. 47. (*b*) Matt. iii. 16. (*c*) Acts ii. 33. (*d*) Exod. xxviii. 40,—42.

having left us hardly any thing more than their names. Joſephus indeed hath given a particular deſcription of them all *; and doubtleſs, a very faithful one, according to their faſhion in his time. But who can ſay, how far it might have altered during many ages, and in ſuch various changes as the hebrew commonwealth had undergone, from the time of Moſes? The account given by the rabbies is very different from his; and St. Jerom's, as to ſome of theſe garments, different from both. The moderns, who have ſet before us lively deſcriptions, in writing, and in pictures, vary ſo much, that ſome of them ſeem to have furniſhed the world with new models for maſquerade habits, rather than to have delineated the real faſhion of the pontifical veſtments †. This caution premiſed, we ſhall endeavour to give you the beſt account we can of theſe garments, in the order in which they were put on.

The firſt was the מכנסי־בד michneſe-badh, which we render "linnen breeches (*a*)." And according to Joſephus, it much reſembled the modern garment, which we call by that name; for he ſays it was faſtened round the middle, εμβαινοντων εις αυτο των ποδων, the feet, or legs, being put into it ‡. Its uſe was "to cover their nakedneſs," as it is expreſſed in the book of Exodus; that is, for the ſake of decency, when they ſtood aloft on the altar, and the people were

* Antiq. lib. iii. cap. 7. tom. 1. p. 138. edit. Haverc.

† Among others, compare Braunius de veſtitu ſacerd. p. 646, 647, 655. edit. 1701. or Witſii Miſcell. tom. 1. lib. ii. diſſert. 2. §. xlviii. with Calmet's dictionary under the word, prieſt.

(*a*) Exod. xxviii. 42.

‡ Antiq. ubi ſupra, §. 1. p. 139.

beneath them, or even when they were on the ground, stooping to perform any part of the sacred service. Moses has left us no description of these drawers, only that they were made of linnen, and that they were to "reach from the loins even to the thighs;" that is, according to the rabbies, to the bottom of the thighs, or to the knees. They also inform us, that the waistband was a little above the navel, and near the heart; and that they were tied about the waist with a string, run through the waistband in the manner of a purse. This garment was common to the high-priests, and to the inferior priests *.

That no such garment was wore in Noah's time, seems evident from the story of his being uncovered in his tent (a); nor by the Jews in the time of Moses, except by the priests, and that perhaps only when they were officiating at the altar; as may be reasonably conjectured from the law in Deuteronomy against the immodest woman (b); for if it had been commonly wore, she could not easily have committed the crime, for which she is condemned to lose her hand. Probably in David's time, it was worn only by the priests; which may be the reason, that when Hanun, king of the Ammonites, "shaved off half the beards of David's servants," or ambassadors, "and cut off their garments in the middle, even to their posteriors," and dimissed them in this disgraceful and indecent condition, "they were greatly ashamed (c)." That this garment was not used among

* Maimon. de apparatu templi, cap. viii. §. xviii. p. 146. Crenii Fasciculi sexti.

(a) Gen. ix. 21. (b) Deut. xxv. 11. (c) 2 Sam. x. 4, 5.

among the Romans, in latter times, even by their priests, appears from Martials ludicrous description of one who was sacrificing:

Ipse super virides aras luctantia pronus
Dum secat, cultro colla, premitque manu,
Ingens iratis apparuit hernia sacris*.

Suetonius's account of the manner of Julius Cæsar's death makes it more than probable, that he wore no such garment. "Utque animadvertit undique se strictis pugionibus peti, toga caput obvolvit; simul sinistra manu sinum ad ima crura deduxit, quo honestius caderet; etiam inferiore corporis parte velata †." Upon the whole, it may be reasonably concluded, that the use of this decent garment had its origin from the divine institution of the jewish priesthood.

The second garment, which was put on after the breeches, was the כתנת chethoneth, or coat, as it is called in our translation (*a*). It was made of linnen (*b*). We have no description of the fashion of it in scripture, except in the visionary appearance of Christ to St. John, in the form and habit of a priest (*c*); and he is said to be ενδεδυμενον ποδηρη, "cloathed with a garment down to the feet," which perfectly agrees with the description the jewish writers give of the chethoneth; who say, that it reached down to the feet; and that it likewise had sleeves which came down to the wrist, and was tied about the neck, in the same manner as the breeches about the waist. So that it

* Lib. 3. epigram. 24.
† In vitâ Jul. Cæs. cap. 82.
(*a*) Exod. xxviii. 40.
(*b*) Exod. xxxix. 27.
(*c*) Rev. i. 13.

was not much unlike a long shirt *. It was common to the high-priest and the inferior priests; except that, perhaps, the tunick of the high-priest was rather made of finer linnen, or wove in a more curious manner; for it is called כתנת חשבן chethoneth tashbèts, which we render the "broidered coat (a)." Ainsworth translates it, "a coat of circled work;" and observes, that it differed from broidered work, because that was of various colours, whereas this coat was all white, but wove in circles, or round hollow places, like eyes. The same word, he remarks, is used afterwards (b) for ouches, or hollow sockets, in which jewels were set. Dr. Lightfoot conceives this tunick to be a sort of diaper, wove in some figure, as circles, or checkers †. The high-priest when he went into the holy of holies on the day of expiation, was clothed only in the vestes albæ, as they are commonly called, or the garments of the common priests (c); yet the tunick which he then wore, is supposed to be somewhat different from, and perhaps meaner than theirs; that it might be more suitable to the peculiar service and deep humiliation of that day. This is thought to be intimated, in the coats made in common for Aaron and his sons, being called כתנת שש chethoneth shèsh (d); whereas the tunick, which the high-priest wore on

* Maimon. de apparatu templi, cap. viii. §. xvii. apud Crenii Fascicul. sextum, p. 146. De longitudine tunicarum, erant illæ talares, quarum manicæ pertinebant ad volam manus, & pro latitudine manus patebant. See other testimonies apud Braunium de vestitu sacerd. lib. ii. cap. ii. §. vii. p. 461. edit. 1680. §. ccxli. p. 372. edit 1701.

(a) Exod. xxviii. 4. (b) ver. 11.

† Temple service, chap. iii.

(c) Lev. xvi. 4. (d) Exod. xxxix. 27.

on the ſolemn feaſt day, is called כתנת־בד chethoneth-badh (*a*). The ſhèſh, is imagined to be a fine ſort of egyptian linnen, ſuch as was worn by their princes; for with it Pharaoh clothed Joſeph (*b*). Some take it to be a fine cotton; whereas the word בד badh, is ſuppoſed to import a common and meaner ſort *.

Braunius is of opinion, that there was no difference between the ſhèſh and the badh, as to the fineneſs of the ſtuff, the michneſe badh, or linnen breeches, being ſpoken of as made of שש משזר ſhèſh moſhzor, "fine twined linnen," as our tranſlators render it. And the only difference between them, which he aſſigns, is, that the badh (being derived from בדד badhadh, ſolus) was made of a ſingle thread, and the ſhèſh (which word ſignifies ſix) was compoſed of ſeveral, perhaps ſix, threads twiſted together. He ſupports this ſentiment by the teſtimony of Maimonides, and various other jewiſh doctors †.

The third garment was the אבנט abnèt, or girdle (*c*). This was likewiſe made of the שש ſhèſh, or fine twined linnen, and curiouſly embroidered with a variety of colours (*d*). Moſes has not acquainted us either with the length or breadth of this girdle. But Joſephus and the rabbies have given us the meaſure of it,

(*a*) Lev. xvi. 4. (*b*) Gen. xli. 42.

* Vid. Cunæum de Repub. Hebr. lib. ii. cap. 1. & Leuſden. Philol. Hebr. mixt. differt. 27. p. 179, 180.

† Vid. Braun. de veſtitu ſacerd. hebr. lib. 1. cap. ii. § iii. p. 23,—25. edit. Amſtel. 1680. alias, §. xvii,—xix. p 17,—19. edit. 1701. cap. vi. §. viii. p. 131,—134. edit. 1680. §. xcii, xciii. p. 101,—103. edit. 1701. cap. vii. §. i,—iv. p. 137,—141. edit. 1680. §. xcv,—xcviii p. 105,—109. edit. 1701.

(*c*) Exod. xxviii. 40 (*d*) Exod. xxxix. 29.

it, though their accounts are very different. It went, according to Josephus, twice about the waist *. But Maimonides makes it to be thirty-two ells long †. If this account be true, the use of it seems to have been, not only to bind the tunick close and tight, but to serve for a warm upper garment, by swathing the body from the arms to the waist; and also to strengthen the back for the laborious work of killing, dressing and burning the sacrifices. However Josephus's account seems the more probable; partly, because so warm a dress would, in that warm climate, have been highly inconvenient, especially when they were engaged in the most laborious part of their employments, or were tending the fire on the altar; and partly, because in the visionary appearance of Christ in the priest's habit, referred to before, he is said to be ‡ "girt about the paps with a golden girdle." An expression, which renders it unlikely, that the greater part of his body was swathed with it; rather intimating, that it was tied once or twice about the breast. Josephus informs us §, that it was tied in a knot before, the ends of it hanging down for ornament, to the feet; but that when the priest was about any work, which obliged him to stoop, and the ends of the girdle would be in his way, he threw them over his left shoulder. Maimonides makes the breadth of the girdle to be three fingers §, Josephus four; and

* Antiq. lib. iii. cap. 7. §. 2. tom. I. p. 140. edit. Haverc.

† De apparatu templi, cap. viii. §. xix. apud Crenii Fasicul. sextum, p. 146, 147.

‡ Antiq ubi supra.

§. Maimon. ubi supra.

and he adds, that it was wove hollow, like a ſnake's ſkin, and ſo ſerved for a purſe, as well as a girdle *, to which uſe, indeed, in ancient times girdles were commonly applied, both among the Jews and Romans. Hence Horace ſaith, Ibit eò, quo vis, qui zonam perdidit †. And zonam perdere is a latin phraſe for being a bankrupt. And hence alſo when our Saviour ſent out his diſciples to preach, he injoined "them to provide neither gold nor ſilver nor braſs εις τας ζωνας, in their purſes," or girdles (a).

The fourth garment was מגבעות migbangnoth, the bonnet or bonnets, as we render the word (b). It was alſo made of the שש ſheſh, or fine twined linnen (c). The ſcripture is wholly ſilent, both as to the faſhion of it, and the quantity of linnen that compoſed it. According to the rabbies deſcription of it, it was much like the turkiſh turbant: they ſay, it conſiſted of a ſlip of linnen ſixteen ells long, wound round the head ‡. Joſephus ſaith, it was like a helmet made of linnen, one wreath being plaited and folded over another, and a thin cap, ſuited to the ſhape of it, put over all, to prevent its unfolding or growing ſlack §.

The high-prieſt's head-dreſs is indeed expreſſed by another word, which we render a mitre; but the Jews reckon the mitre and the bonnet

* Joſeph. ubi ſupra.

† Epiſtolarum, lib. 2. epiſt. 2. l. 40.

(a) Matt. x. 9. (b) Exod. xxviii. 40. (c) Exod. xxxix. 28.

‡ Maimon. de apparatu templi, cap. viii, §. ii, & xix, p. 140, 141. & 146, apud Crenii Faſcicul. ſext. Vid. Braunium de veſtitu ſacerd. lib. ii. cap. iv. §. xi, xii. p. 512, 513. edit. 1680. §. cccixxxviii, cccixxxix. p. 414, 415. edit. 1701.

§ Ubi ſupra.

bonnet to be the ſame, only folded up in a ſomewhat different manner, according to the dignity of the perſon that wore it. They deſcribe the mitre, as wound into a broader and more beautiful form, like the turkiſh turbant; whereas the bonnet was made into a more conical figure, though not into a point, like the perſian turbant; and this is what Joſephus means, when he calls the bonnet, κωνον *.

The ſacerdotal veſtments, peculiar to the high-prieſt, were the robe, the ephod, the breaſt-plate and the holy crown. Theſe are commonly called the veſtes aureæ, to diſtinguiſh them from the plain or linnen garments †, already deſcribed; for they were richly ornamented with gold and jewels.

The firſt was the מְעִיל mengnil, or blue robe, which was wore over the linnen veſt. We have the deſcription of it in the book of Exodus, "And thou ſhalt make the robe of the ephod all of blue, and there ſhall be an hole in the top of it, in the midſt thereof; it ſhall have a binding of woven work, round about the hole of it, as it were the hole of an habergeon, that it be not rent. And beneath, upon the hem of it, thou ſhalt make pomegranates of blue, and of purple, and of ſcarlet, round about the hem thereof, and bells of gold between them, round about; a golden bell, and a pomegranate, a golden bell and a pomegranate upon the hem of the robe round about (*a*)." It is called

* Antiq. lib. iii. cap. 7. §. 3. tom. 1, p. 141, edit. Haverc. Vid. Braunium de veſtitu ſacerd. lib. ii. cap. iv. §. xiv, xv, edit. 1680. §. cccxci, cccxcii. p. 418, & ſeq. edit. 1701.

† Maimon. de apparatu templi, cap. viii. ab init.

(*a*) Exod. xxviii. 31,—34.

ed the robe of the ephod, not only becauſe it was wore along with, and next under it, but becauſe, ſays Maimonides, it was girded with the ephod *; that is, the girdle of the ephod ſerved for this robe as well as for the ephod itſelf, and bound theſe two garments, together, to the body. It is not certain, of what ſtuff this robe was made; but as it was coloured, it is not probable, it was linnen; becauſe that takes the dye the worſt of any ſort of ſtuff, of which garments are made. Some, therefore, will have it to be made of wool, others of cotton: The ſyriac verſion, and after it the old flemiſh, make it to be yellow ſilk. But, as to the colour, though we are not very certain of the meaning of the hebrew word תכלת techeleth, yet it ſeems reaſonable to follow the ſeptuagint, which renders it hyacinth; and ſo does the chaldee paraphraſe. What occaſions the uncertainty in this caſe is, that there is both a ſtone, and a flower, called the hyacinth; the ſtone, yellow; and the flower blue. But conſidering that the ephod, which was wore over the upper part of this robe, was embroidered with ſcarlet and gold, and that golden bells hung at the bottom of the robe itſelf, it is more likely that the colour was that of the hyacinth flower, than that of the ſtone, ſince the gold and ſcarlet would ſhow to more advantage on blue, than on yellow; and, therefore, we tranſlate the word תכלת techeleth, blue.

Round the bottom of this robe, in the manner of a fringe, there were little golden bells, and balls of blue, purple and ſcarlet, in the ſhape

* Ubi ſupra, cap. x. §. iii. p. 154. Crenii Faſcic. ſext.

shape of pomegranates, which hung interchangeably. We are not informed in the scripture of the number or size either of the bells or pomegranates. But the rabbies, who are not content to be supposed ignorant of any thing, have supplied both these defects; assuring us, that the number of each was just seventy two *, the number of the elders of Israel; and that each pomegranate was as large as an egg †. Now since the bells, in order to their making a becoming and graceful appearance, must be supposed to be as large as the pomegranates, and likewise allowing a proper space betwixt each bell and pomegranate, for the sounding of the bells, one cannot well admit less room than a nail of a yard, or two inches and a quarter for each; which multiplied by the whole number of bells and pomegranates amounts to one hundred forty-four nails, or nine yards: an incredible circumference indeed! about double the size of a modern hoop petticoat.

This robe is said by Josephus ‡, and the rabbies § to be without sleeves, having a hole on each side, to put the arms through. Moses describes it, as having a hole at the top, to put the head through; and saith, that this hole had

* Maimon. de apparatu templi, cap. iv. p. 148. Crenii Fascic sexti.

† R. S. Jarchi ad Exod. xxviii. 31. Vid. ejus verba apud Braun. de vestit. sacerd. lib. ii. cap. v §. xviii. p. 565,566. edit. 1680. §. cccxxii. p. 453. edit. 1701.

‡ This is undoubtedly the meaning of the following words in Josephus, καὶ ὅθεν αἱ χεῖρες διήξονται, χίτος ἦν. etiam aperta est, qua manus exseruntur. Antiq. lib. iii. cap. vii. §. 4. tom 1. p. 142. edit. Haverc.

§ Maimon. ubi supra, §. iii.

had a ſtrong binding round it, to prevent its being rent, in putting it on and off (*a*).

This hole in the top of the robe is expreſſed in the Hebrew by פי ראשו phi-roſhu, the mouth of his head, or through which the prieſt put his head; or by פי מעילו phi-haamenghil, the mouth, or hole, of the robe (*b*). This will explain what is meant by the Pſalmiſt, when he deſcribes the precious ointment, that was poured on Aaron's head, as running down "to the ſkirts of his garments," פי מדותיו phi-middothaiv (*c*); the mouth, or collar of his robe; as our tranſlators have rendered the word phi in another place (*d*), and Amſworth in this; agreeable to which is biſhop Patrick's paraphraſe. I can ſee no foundation, therefore for that very diſagreeable idea, ſuggeſted by the generality of our metrical tranſlators, not excepting even the ingenious Dr. Watts; that the oil was poured in ſo profuſe a quantity on Aaron's head, as to deſcend, not only upon his beard, but to the bottom of his cloaths. Which, indeed, it is not probable, God would have directed to be made in ſo expenſive and beautiful a manner, if they had been deſigned to be ſmeared with oil, and thereby to be utterly ſpoiled.

I take the caſe to be, that the hair of his head and beard was to be well anointed to the extremity, which probably reached as low as the collar of his robe. This was graceful and ornamental, according to the faſhion of that country, and thoſe times. Hence we read, not only of "wine that maketh glad the heart of

(*a*) Exod. xxviii. 32. (*b*) Exod. xxxix. 23. (*c*) Pſal. cxxxiii. 2. (*d*) Job xxx. 18.

of man, but of oil to make his face to shine (a)," or his outside, for so פנים panim, frequently signifies, in opposition to his heart: referring probably to the anointing the hair, which was then the fashion. Hence it is likewise that David, among other expressions of the plenty and glory of the state, to which God had advanced him, particularly mentions his anointing his head with oil (b). It was a mark of the gaiety and luxury of men of pleasure, that they "anointed themselves with the chief ointments (c)." The same custom continued to our Saviour's time, as is evident from a certain woman's pouring the precious ointment on his head, when he was entertained at the house of Simon the Leper (d); and from the gentle reproof which our Lord gave Simon the Pharisee, on an occasion of the like nature, for omitting that common act of civility (e). On the whole, beside the mystical intention of the sacerdotal unction, it was designed as the garments themselves were, "for glory and for beauty (f);" which it could not have been, if they had been thereby daubed and spoiled.

It may perhaps be objected, that if these beautiful vestments were not defaced by the anointing, they must, however, have been grievously defiled with the sprinkling of blood and oil upon them, which was one ceremony prescribed and observed at the consecration of the high-priest (g). But as to this, let it be remarked, that the english word, sprinkle, is used by our translators for two hebrew words, זרק zarak, and נזה nazah, as different from each

(a) Psal. civ. 15. (b) Psal. xxiii. 5. (c) Amos vi. 6. (d) Matt. xxvi. 7. (e) Luke vii. 46. (f) Exod. xxviii. 2. (g) Exod. xxix. 21.

each other in ſenſe as they are in ſound. The former denotes ſprinkling in a large quantity; as when Moſes is commanded to take "handfuls of the aſhes of the furnace, and ſprinkle them towards heaven (*a*);" and when, in Ezekiel's viſion, the man clothed in linnen is ordered to "fill his hand with coals of fire, and ſcatter, or ſprinkle, them over the city (*b*)." Again, this word is applied to ſuch a ſprinkling or rather pouring of clean water, as ſhould cleanſe the perſons, on whom it was poured, from all their filthineſs (*c*); which ſeems to imply a conſiderable quantity. It is the word uſed for ſprinkling the blood of the ſacrifices round about upon the altar (*d*); which implies, that no inconſiderable proportion of it was diſpoſed of in that manner, which was afterwards dried and conſumed by the fire.

The other word נָזָה nazah, is uſed for ſprinkling in a ſmall quantity; as when a man dips the end of his finger in ſome liquor, and with that ſprinkles a drop or two upon any thing. Thus, in performing the rites of cleanſing a leper, the prieſt is ordered to pour oil into the palm of his left hand, and to ſprinkle ſome of it with his right finger (*e*). Again, "the prieſt ſhall dip his finger in the blood, and ſprinkle ſeven times before the Lord (*f*)." In the ſame manner was the high-prieſt to ſprinkle the blood of the ſacrificed bullock upon the mercy ſeat. (*g*). It is not ſurely to be imagined, that he was to throw any conſiderable quantity of blood upon it, to defile and deface that beauti-

(*a*) Exod. ix. 8. (*b*) Ezek. x. 2. (*c*) Ezek. xxxvi. 25. (*d*) Lev. vii. 2. Exod. xxix. 16. (*e*) Lev. xiv. 26, 27. (*f*) Lev. iv. 6. (*g*) Lev. xvi. 14.

ſul piece of carving, and the curious images of the cherubim. He was only, with the tip of his finger, juſt to ſpot it ſeven times, and probably in a part where it could be eaſily wiped off. Now, this is the word uſed for the ſprinkling of Aaron's garments; which, I think, may be conſidered as the ſetting God's mark upon them, perhaps by a ſpot in one particular place; which would no more deface their beauty, then one black letter would ſully a clean cambrick handkerchief.

But to return to the מְעִיל mengmil, or blue robe, which was put on over the head, and covered the body all round; but how low it reached, the ſcripture no where informs us. The ſeptuagint calls it ὑποδυτην ποδηρη, and Joſephus ποδηνεμον *; which means, that it reached down to the feet. But the length, which we commonly ſee expreſſed in the pictures of the high-prieſt, to about the middle of the leg, is probably the true one; becauſe, otherways, the tunica ocellata would have been quite hid by it. Beſides, this would be more convenient for the ſounding of the bells, which hung on the bottom of it, than if it came quite down to the feet.

The ſecond of the aureæ veſtes was the ephod, ſo called from אָפַד aphad, amicivit or accinxit; which verb we render to gird and to bind, in the only two places wherein it occurs (a). Ephod ſeems to have been the name of an upper garment, which was wore by perſons of diſtinction of various characters. We read

* Antiq. lib. iii. cap. 7. §. 4. tom. 1. p. 142. edit. Haverc.

(a) Exod. xxix. 5. Lev. viii. 7.

read that king David (*a*), and the eighty-five prieſts, who were murdered by Saul (*b*), and even Samuel, when a child (*c*), were girded with a linnen ephod. It is, therefore, probable that the peculiarity of the high-prieſt's ephod did not conſiſt in its being of a different ſhape from that which was wore by other perſons; but in the richneſs of the materials, of which it was made, and the fine embroidery and jewels with which it was adorned. Inſomuch that it might properly be called the ephod, κατ' ἐξοχην.

The deſcription of this garment in the book of Exodus, relates only to its materials, and not to its ſhape or form: It was made "of gold, of blue and of purple, of ſcarlet, and fine twined linnen with cunning work (*d*)." We are not very certain concerning the nature of theſe colours. I have already given ſome account of the word תכלת techeleth, which we render blue. As for the ארגמן argaman, or purple, as it is rendered, it is generally thought to be a dye made of the blood of a ſhell-fiſh of that name, which was taken on the coaſt of Paleſtine, and for which the Tyrians afterward became famous *.

Some jewiſh etymologiſts make ארגמן argaman, to be a kind of adjective of the word רגם regem, which, according to them, ſignifies a prince or a royal perſon; wherefore they would tranſlate it a princely colour, or ſuch as kings wore themſelves, and beſtowed on their greateſt favourites. Thus Daniel was clothed with purple by Belſhazzar (*e*).

(*a*) 2 Sam. vi. 14. (*b*) 1 Sam. xxii. 18.
(*c*) 1 Sam. ii. 18. (*d*) Exod. xxviii. 6, &c.
* Vid. Bochart. hieroz. part 2. lib. v. cap. 10, & 11.
(*e*) Dan. v. 29.

As for the ſhape of the ephod, the ſeptuagint calls it ἐπωμὶς *, which ſignifies, that it was wore on the ſhoulders. Joſephus ſaith, it was a cubit long †. St. Jerom compares it to the roman caracalla, which was a ſort of ſhort cloak, only that it had a head or hood to it, ſomething like the capuchins the ladies now wear, which the ephod had not ‡. Maimonides ſaith, it reached down to the feet; which ſome ſuppoſe to be true of the back, though not of the fore part. It conſiſted, they imagine, of two parts, the one an oblong, rectangular piece, hanging down behind from the ſhoulders to the feet; and the rabbies ſay, it was the breadth of his back who wore it from ſhoulder to ſhoulder; the other, a ſhort, rectangular piece which hung down before, the length of a cubit. Theſe two pieces were joined together, upon the ſhoulders, with ſome proper faſtening, as loops, buttons or the like §.

The high-prieſt's ephod had a very rich button upon each ſhoulder, made of a large onyx ſtone ſet in gold; ſo large, that the names of the twelve tribes of Iſrael were engraven, ſix upon each ſtone (*a*).

The word שֹׁהַם ſhoham, which we render onyx, the ſeptuagint tranſlates σμαραγδος, an emerald. But we have no certain knowledge, either of this, or of any of the twelve ſtones of

* And ſo Joſephus, Antiq. lib. iii. cap. vii. §. 6. Oper. tom. 1. p. 150.

† Antiq. lib. iii. cap. vii. §. 5. p. 143. edit. Haverc.

‡ Hieron. ad Fabiolam, epiſt, 128.

§ Maimon, de apparatu templi, cap. ix. §. ix. p. 150, Crenii Faſcicul. ſext.

(*a*) Exod. xxviii. 9,—12.

of the breaſt plate, and may as well be ſatisfied with our tranſlation as with any other *.

To the ephod there belonged a curious girdle, of the ſame rich fabric with the ephod itſelf. This is ſaid to be "upon the ephod (*a*)," that is, wove with it, as Maimonides underſtands it; and coming out from it on each ſide, it was brought under the arms like a ſaſh, and tied upon the breaſt †. Upon the ephod was put

3dly, the חשן משפט choſhen miſhpat, "the breaſt-plate of judgment (*b*); ſo called, becauſe the high-prieſt always wore it when he conſulted the oracle, by which were determined all doubtful caſes of national importance. The breaſt-plate was made of the ſame rich materials with the ephod, two ſpans long, and one broad; but folding up double, it was a ſpan ſquare (*c*). The breaſt-plate was faſtened upon the ephod by rings of gold at the four corners, the two upper rings being hung upon, or faſtened to, the ſhoulder pieces with golden chains, and the two lower rings tied to the girdle of the ephod with blue ſtrings or ribbands (*d*). The breaſt-plate was adorned with four rows

* Braunius hath conſidered the ſubject at large, de veſtitu ſacerd. hebræor. lib. ii. à cap. viii. ad xix. incluſivè. p. 497,—588. edit. 1701. See likewiſe Epiphanius de xii gemmis. Buxtorf the younger. in his Exercitat. de arca fœderis, & Chriſt. Cartwright. elect. targum. rabbin. in loc.

(*a*) Exod. xxviii. 8.

† Maimon. de apparatu templi, ubi ſupra, & §. xi. p. 152.

(*b*) Exod. xxviii. 15.

(*c*) ver. 16. A ſpan is half a cubit, as appears from Ezek. xliii. 13, 17. where in one verſe it is ſaid, that the border of the altar ſhall be a ſpan; in the other, that it ſhall be half a cubit.

(*d*) Exod. xxviii. 22,—28.

of jewels ſet in ſockets of gold, three jewels in a row; that is, in three perpendicular rows, and four horizontal. Upon theſe jewels were graven the names of the twelve patriarchs, one name upon each jewel (*a*). If our tranſlators have given us the right names of theſe ſtones, ſome of them are ſo hard, (as particularly the diamond,) that we might well wonder how they engraved them. But here the Talmudiſts wonderfully help us, by aſſuring us, that they were not engraven with any tool, which would have waſted ſome of the ſubſtance of thoſe precious ſtones, but by a miraculous worm, not now in being, which being ſet upon each of theſe ſtones, crept and ſunk itſelf along thoſe places which Moſes had marked out to it, and ſo impreſſed the letters upon the ſtones, as if it had been on ſoft wax, without taking off any part of it *. But as we do not pretend to know, what, or how hard, theſe ſtones were, we ſtand in no need of this miraculous worm, to account for the difficulty of engraving them.

The fourth garment, or rather ornament, peculiar to the high-prieſt was the plate, or crown of gold, which he wore upon the front of his mitre (*b*). This is likewiſe called "the holy crown (*c*)," and the plate of the holy crown (*d*). The hebrew word ציץ tſits, which we tranſlate a plate, properly ſignifies a flower. The ſeptuagint renders it πεταλον, which ſignifies a leaf, becauſe, ſaith Ainſworth, it appeared fair and glorious. Or rather, perhaps, it is expreſſed

(*a*) Exod. xxviii. 17,—21.

* Braun. de veſtitu ſacerdot. lib. ii. cap. vii. §. ccccLxvii. p. 490. edit. 1701.

(*b*) Exod. xxviii. 36,—38. (*b*) Exod. xxxix. 6,

(*c*) Exod. xxxix. 30.

expreſſed by a word, which ſignifies a flower, or leaf, becauſe it is thin, that ſo it might not be burdenſome to wear. However, we muſt not conceive it to be near ſo thin as our leaf gold, becauſe it had letters engraven upon it, which leaf gold will not admit of. The ſize and form of this plate, or crown, are not expreſſed by Moſes; but if the jewiſh doctors are worthy of credit, it was two fingers broad, and made in a circular form ſuited to the ſhape of the head, and ſo long that it reached from ear to ear, and was faſtened upon a blue lace, or ribband, which was tied behind the head *; and as this gold plate reached but about half round the head, the remaining part of the ribband, which was not covered with it, as far as to the tying, was richly ornamented with artificial flowers of embroidered work. This plate had the following motto engraved on it, קדש ליהוה kodheſh laihovah, which is rendered in our tranſlation, agreeable to moſt of the ancient verſions, "Holineſs to the Lord." The manner of engraving this motto is ſaid to be "like the engraving of a ſignet." But whether that is to be underſtood that the letters were ſunk as in a ſeal, or protuberant as in the impreſſion; as alſo, whether the two words were wrote in one line or two, are points which the jewiſh doctors muſt be left to diſpute and determine among themſelves.

It has been cuſtomary in other nations, as Braunius ſhows †, to write inſcriptions on the crown of princes and heroes; to which there ſeems

* Maimon. de apparatu templi. cap ix. §. 1. p. 147. Crenii Faſcicul. ſext. & R. S. Jarchi in loc.

† De veſtitu ſacerd. hebræor. lib. ii, cap. xxii. §. 15. edit. Amſtel. 1680. §. DCLXX. p. 636. edit. 1701.

to be an alluſion in that paſſage of the Revelation, where antichriſt is deſcribed as a lewd woman, with an inſcription on her forehead: "Myſtery, Babylon the great, the mother of harlots, and the abominations of the earth (a)." However, I imagine, the reference, in this place, is more eſpecially to the jewiſh high-prieſt, and to the inſcription on his crown; becauſe this woman immediately before, is ſaid to be "arrayed in purple, and ſcarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious ſtones;" which were the colours and ornaments of his veſtes aureæ, or golden veſtments. The deſcription ſeems, therefore, to intimate, that the perſon was one, who would aſſume the character of Pontifex Maximus. How applicable this is to the pope every one may perceive, who is not greatly prejudiced; eſpecially as the word Myſterium was formerly engraven on the papal crown. But when the Proteſtants began to remark its congruity to the forecited paſſage in the Revelation, Pope Julius the third ordered a new crown to be made, on which inſtead of the former motto, was engraven Julius, pontifex maximus *.

Joſephus gives us the deſcription of a more pompous crown, which, in his time, the high-prieſts wore over their mitre, on which was emboſſed the calyx, or cup of a flower, reſembling that produced by a plant, which the Greeks call νοσκυαμος †. But ſince, according to the original inſtitution, this was no part of the pontifical dreſs, it does not belong to our province, particularly to conſider it. Poſſibly

(a) Rev. xvii. 5.

* See Poli Synopsis in loc.

† Antiq. lib. iii. cap. vii. §. 7. tom. 1. p. 154. edit. Haverc.

ſibly this might be the crown, which Alexander the Great preſented to Jaddua when he went out to meet him, and which was afterwards wore on grand and ſolemn occaſions; in like manner as perſons wear medals, preſented to them by princes, as badges of honour.

Thus have we conſidered the pontifical veſtes aureæ. To theſe, particularly to the breaſt-plate, belonged the Urim and Thummim: "Thou ſhalt put in the breaſt-plate of judgment the Urim and the Thummim; and they ſhall be upon Aaron's heart, when he goeth in before the Lord; and Aaron ſhall bear the judgment of the children of Iſrael upon his heart before the Lord continually (*a*)." The words אורים and תמים Urim and Thummim, ſignify lights and perfections. The ſeptuagint renders them δηλωσιν and αληθειαν, manifeſtation and truth. But what they mean, as applied to the pontifical breaſt-plate, is not eaſily aſcertained. Moſes having ſaid little concerning them, hath left room for innumerable conjectures, wherewith many pages and whole volumes of later writers have been filled. And after all, nothing is more pertinent, than the following ſentence of rabbi Kimchi, "He is on the ſafeſt ſide, ſaith he, who frankly confeſſes his ignorance; ſo that we ſeem to need a prieſt to ſtand up with Urim and Thummim, to teach us what the Thummim were (*b*)."

We read of no commandment, or direction, given to Moſes for the making of them; he is only ordered to put them in the breaſt-plate: "Thou ſhalt put in the breaſt-plate of judgment

(*a*) Exod. xxviii. 30. (*b*) Alluding to Ezra ii. 63.

ment the Urim and the Thummim (*a*)." There is no mention of them in the account of the making of Aaron's garments in the thirty-ninth chapter of Exodus; only in that of cloathing the high-prieſt in Leviticus, it is ſaid, "He put the breaſt-plate upon him, alſo he put in the breaſt-plate the Urim and Thummim." From hence ſome of the hebrew doctors conclude, they were not the work of any human artificer, but of God himſelf*. The uſe of them was to enquire of God, and to receive an anſwer by them concerning his will. It is ſaid in the book of Numbers, that Eleazar the prieſt ſhall aſk counſel for Joſhua after the judgment of Urim before the Lord (*b*). And when Saul "enquired of the Lord, the Lord anſwered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by the prophets (*c*)." And when Moſes bleſſed the tribes of Iſrael, of Levi he ſaid, "Let thy Urim and Thummim be with thy holy one (*d*)." The opinion concerning the Urim and Thummim, moſt generally received among the Jews, is, that they were the twelve precious ſtones in the breaſt-plate, on which were engraven the names of the twelve tribes of Iſrael; and that the oracle gave its anſwer to any queſtion propoſed, by cauſing ſuch letters in them to ſhine with a ſuperior luſtre, or to appear prominent above the reſt, as formed the words of the anſwer; which, ſome ſay, the high-prieſt was by inſpiration taught to ſpell, and diſpoſe in their proper order

(*a*) Exod. xxviii. 30.

* Rabbi Bechai, quoted by Schickard. jure regio, cap. 1. theor. ii. p. 19, 20. edit. Carpzov.

(*b*) Numb. xxvii. 21. (*c*) 1 Sam. xxviii. 6. (*d*) Deut. xxxiii. 8.

der, though others maintain the ſeveral letters ſhone or appeared prominent, not all together, but one after another, in the order which formed the words of the anſwer *. And whereas all the letters of the alphabet are not found in the names of the twelve tribes, the Talmudiſts inform us, that the names of Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob, were likewiſe engraven over the name of Reuben; and under that of Benjamin, the words שִׁבְטֵי יָהּ ſhibhte-Jah, "the tribes of the Lord;" and by this means the alphabet was completed. Joſephus, and ſome others, imagine, the anſwer was returned, by the ſtones of the breaſt-plate appearing with an unuſual luſtre, when it was favourable, or in the contrary caſe, dim †. Others ſuppoſe, the Urim and Thummim were ſomething enclоſed between the folding, or doubling, of the breaſt-plate; which, they ſay, was doubled for that very purpoſe, that it might be fit, as a purſe, to contain them. What they were, is, however, differently conjectured. Some of the rabbies will have them to be the Tetragrammaton, or the word יהוה Jehovah, which, they ſay, was wrote in a myſterious manner in two parts, and two different ways ‡. Chriſtophorus de Caſtro, and

* Vid. Schickard. de jure regio, cap. i. theor. ii. p. 24. edit. Carpzov. But Scheringham, on the miſhnical book Joma, cap. 8. §. 5. not. 11. p. 251, 252. ſaith, that Schickard was miſtaken in ſuppoſing it the opinion of the rabbies, that the letters ſhone, or became prominent, in the order which compoſed the words of the anſwer; but that their notion was, that by an audible divine voice pronouncing the words, the high-prieſt was prevented from miſtaking either the order of the letters, which were, or the points which were not, engraven on the breaſt-plate. See likewiſe Carpzov. ad Schickard.

† Antiq. lib. iii. cap. viii. §. 9. op. tom. 1. p. 164.

‡ Vid. R. Solomon. & Targum Jonathan. citat. à Schickard jure regio, cap. 1. theor. ii. p. 20, 21.

and after him Dr. Spencer *, maintain them to be two little images, ſhut up in the doubling of the breaſt-plate, which gave the oracular anſwer from thence by an articulate voice. They accordingly, derive them from the Egyptians, who conſulted their Lares, and had an oracle, or Teraphim, which they called truth: which, however, it is more likely they borrowed from the Jews, then the Jews from them. This conceit of Dr. Spencer's has been ſo abundantly confuted by Dr. Pocock †, that it does not appear to have been adopted by any ſince his time. The more common opinion among Chriſtians concerning the oracle by Urim and Thummin, and which Dr. Prideaux eſpouſes ‡, is, that when the high-prieſt appeared before the veil, clothed with his ephod and breaſt-plate, to aſk counſel of God, the anſwer was given by an audible voice from the mercy ſeat, within the veil: which, he thinks, beſt anſwers to the ſcripture expreſſion of "enquiring at the mouth of the Lord (*a*);" and God's "communing," and talking, with thoſe who conſulted him (*b*). But this account will by no means agree with the hiſtory of David's conſulting the oracle by Abiathar: "When he knew Saul ſecretly practiſed miſchief againſt him, he ſaid to Abiathar the prieſt, bring hither

* Vid. Diſſert. de Urim & Thummim.

† Comment. on Hoſea, chap. iii. 4. See likewiſe Witſius's Ægyptiacâ; in the firſt book and eighth chapter of which learned performance, he hath given an account of Spencer's hypotheſis, and in the ſecond book, the third, tenth, eleventh and twelfth chapters, a diſtinct and accurate confutation of it.

‡ See his connect. part 1. book 3. ſub anno 535 ante Chriſt.

(*a*) Joſh. ix. 14 (*b*) Exod. xxv. 22.

ther the ephod;" and then he enquired of the Lord, "Will the men of Keilah deliver me up into his hands (*a*)?" And on another occaſion, "I pray thee, ſaid he to Abiathar, briug me hither the ephod; and he brought the ephod; and David enquired at the Lord, ſhall I purſue after this troop? &c (*b*)." On both the occaſions, the ephod being uſed in conſulting the oracle, it is concluded the anſwer was given by Urim. And that could not be by a voice from the mercy ſeat upon the ark, the ark being then at Kirjath-jearim, a city in the tribe of Judah (*c*); whereas David and Abiathar were in the foreſt of Hareth, the firſt time of conſulting the oracle (*d*), and at Ziklag in the country of the Philiſtines, the ſecond (*e*).

I will only mention one opinion more on this ſubject, that which is eſpouſed and ſupported by the learned Braunius. He ſuppoſes, that when Moſes is commanded to put in the breaſtplate the Urim and Thummim, which words are in the plural number, and ſignify lights and perfections, it means only that he ſhould make choice of the moſt perfect ſet of ſtones, and have them ſo poliſhed as to give the brighteſt and fineſt luſtre *. This is likewiſe the notion of Hottinger †. And on this ſuppoſition, the uſe and deſign of the Urim and Thummim, or of theſe exquiſitely poliſhed jewels in the pectoral

(*a*) 1 Sam. xxiii. 9,—11. (*b*) chap. xxx. 7, 8. (*c*) 1 Sam. vii. 1, 2. (*d*) 1 Sam. xxii. 5. (*e*) chap. xxix. 11. and xxx. 1.

* See the reaſons with which he ſupports this opinion, in his treatiſe de Veſtitu ſacerd. Hebræor. lib. ii. cap. xx. §. xviii,—xxi. p. 786,—773. Amſtel. 1680. §. DCXXXI,—DCXXXV. p. 605,—610. edit. 1701.

† Vid. Hotting. annot. in Godw. Moſen & Aaron. l. i. cap. 5. not. 11.

ural, was only to be a ſymbol of the divine preſence, and of the light and perfection of the prophetic inſpiration; and, as ſuch, conſtantly to be worn by the high-prieſt in the exercife of his ſacred function, eſpecially in conſulting the oracle.*

Amidſt this great variety of ſentiments we may indulge this conſolatory reflection, that if a more clear and certain knowledge of this ſubject had been neceſſary or uſeful, the ſcripture account, beyond all queſtion, would have been more diſtinct and particular †.

Having deſcribed the ſacerdotal veſtments, it only remains, that I add a few general remarks concerning them.

1ſt, The prieſts wore theſe garments only when they officiated; at other times, it does not appear, they were diſtinguiſhed by their habits from other men ‡. It is ſaid, theſe veſtments "ſhall be upon Aaron and upon his ſons, when they come in unto the tabernacle of the congregation, or when they come near unto the altar to miniſter in the holy place (a)." And again, they are called, "the clothes of ſervice, to do ſervice in the holy place, and the holy garments for Aaron the prieſt, and his ſon's garments,

* Braun. de Veſtitu, ubi ſupra, §. xxv.—xxvii. p. 772, —782. edit. Amſtel. 1680. §. DCXL,—DCXLIII. p. 613,—617. edit. 1701.

† See on this ſubject Lightfoot's handful of gleanings upon Exod. §. xlviii. Buxtorf in his exercitat. de arca fœderis Schickard. jus regium hebræor. cum annot. Carpzov. cap. 1. theor. 3. p. 17,—46. and Sheringham in Joma apud Miſhna Surenhuſii, cap. 8. §. 5. not. 11. tom. 2. p. 251, 252.

‡ Vid. Selden. de Succeſſ. in Pontif. lib. ii. cap. 7. Oper. vol. 2. p. 183. præſertim de Synedr. lib. iii. cap. ii. §. 3. Op. vol. 1. tom. 2. p. 1689,—1711.

(a) Exod. xxviii. 43.

ments, to miniſter in the prieſt's office (*a*)." Accordingly Joſephus, ſpeaking of the prieſts, ſaith, they were habited like the common people, adding, he only who miniſters, wears the ſacred veſtments *. It is reaſonably ſuppoſed, that ſome of the "chambers built round about againſt the wall of the temple (*b*)," were veſtries, in which the prieſts dreſſed for their miniſtry, and laid up the ſacred veſtments when the ſervice was over. This is confirmed by the following paſſage in Ezekiel's viſion of the temple and the holy ſervice, "When they go forth into the outer court, even into the court of the people, they ſhall put off their garments, wherein they miniſtered and lay them in the holy chambers; and they ſhall put on other garments (*c*)." This remark, perhaps, may furniſh us with the beſt account of Paul's not knowing the high-prieſt, Annanias, when he appeared before him in the Sanhedrim (*d*), becauſe being not engaged in any duty of his miniſterial function, he had not on his pontifical robes, nor was diſtinguiſhed by any particular habit; and as in thoſe times the high-prieſt was often changed by the roman power, ſo as rather to have become an annual officer, than as he ought to have been according to the law of Moſes, one for life, and as Paul was now grown a ſtranger at Jeruſalem, it is very probable, he might never have ſeen him before; or if he had, in his pontifical robes in the

(*a*) chap. xxxix. 21.

* Vid. Joſeph. de bell. Jud. lib. v. cap. v. §. 7. and Selden's obſervations on the paſſage, in his treatiſe de Synedr. ubi ſupra, p. 1711.

(*b*) 1 Kings vi. 5. (*c*) Ezek. xlv. 19. (*d*) Acts xxiii. 5.

the temple, where he had lately attended for ſeven days ſucceſſively (*a*); he might not have taken ſuch particular notice of his perſon as readily to know him again, in another place and another dreſs. This I take to be an eaſier ſolution than to render οὐκ οἶδα (as ſome do) "I acknowledge him not to be high-prieſt," on account of his procuring the office by corruption and bribery; or to ſuppoſe, with Dr. Whitby, that the ſame prophetick impulſe which had moved him to utter that prophecy againſt him, "God ſhall ſmite thee, thou whited wall (*b*)," did not ſuffer him to conſider, juſt at that time, that it was the high-prieſt to whom he ſpoke.

Godwin ſaith, the high-prieſt might not wear his ſacred garments abroad in the city, unleſs on ſome urgent occaſion; as when Simeon the juſt went forth to meet Alexander. But his name, according to Joſephus was not Simeon the juſt, but Jaddua *, his grandfather †.

2dly, The ſacerdotal veſtments were provided at the expence, not of the prieſts, but of the people ‡. As for the pontifical veſtes aureæ, which were exceeding rich and coſtly, they are ſuppoſed to have been provided out of the publick treaſury; and the other ſacerdotal garments, either the ſame way, or by free will offerings. We are told (*c*), that "when ſome of the chief of the fathers came to ſee the temple,

(*a*) Acts xxi. 27. (*b*) Acts xxiii. 3.

* Antiq. lib. xi. cap. viii. §. 4, 5. tom. 1. p. 580,—582. See alſo an account of the affair in Prideaux's connect. part 1. book 7. ſub anno 332, ante Chriſt.

† Compare Joſeph. Antiq. ubi ſupra, §. 7. p. 582. with lib. xii. cap. ii. §. 4. p. 589.

‡ Maimon. de apparatu templi, cap. viii. §. vii. p 142, Crenii Faſcic ſext. (*c*) Ezra ii. 68, 69.

temple, which was rebuilding after the captivity, they gave according to their ability unto the treaſure of the work, not only gold and ſilver, but an hundred prieſts garments." Again, "The Tirſhatha, or Nehemiah, the governor, gave to the treaſury (beſides gold and ſilver there mentioned) five hundred and thirty prieſts garments (*a*)." And "the reſt of the people gave ſixty ſeven (*b*)."

The Talmudiſts and Maimonides ſay, that all free will offerings of that ſort muſt be given to the whole congregation, that is, to the officers, who managed its concerns; inſomuch that if the mother of a prieſt brought her ſon a garment, it was to be given not to him, but to them *, and they might aſſign the uſe of it to whom they pleaſed. Indeed it does not ſeem likely, the ſacerdotal garments ſhould be the property of particular prieſts, and worn by them only; eſpecially when the prieſts were divided, as they were in David's time, into twenty four courſes, and each inferior prieſt officiated at the temple, only a fortnight in a year. They were deſigned therefore for the common uſe of the prieſts, as they came in their turns to miniſter.

3dly, The rabbies ſay, that when the garments of the inferior prieſts were grown foul, they were not waſhed, but cut into ſhreds, to make wicks for the lamps of the ſanctuary; and when the high-prieſts veſtments were left

(*a*) Nehem. vii. 70. (*b*) ver. 72.

* Gemar. Hieroſolym. tit. Shek. cap. iv. See this, and a quotation from the Babylonian Gemara, and from Maimonides, in Braunius de Veſtitu, lib. ii. cap. xxiv. §. xv, p. 839. edit. Amſtel. 1680. cap. xxv. §. dccviii. p. 667. edit 1701.

off, they were put to no further uſe, but hid in ſome ſecret place *. But of this the ſcripture ſays nothing.

4thly, You will obſerve, that neither the high-prieſt, nor thoſe of the lower order, wore any thing either on their hands or feet, while they were employed in their miniſtry. There is no garment aſſigned to either, in any ſcripture catalogue. The ſacrifical ſervices, in which the prieſts were chiefly employed, would not conveniently admit of their wearing gloves; and in publick worſhip to be bearfoot ſeems to have been reckoned a token of reverence even before the giving of the law. For when God appeared to Moſes in the buſh, he commanded him to "put his ſhoes from off his feet, becauſe the place whereon he ſtood was holy ground (*a*)." In thoſe days this was an uſual token of reverence during divine worſhip, when men conſidered themſelves as in the more immediate preſence of God. It was fit therefore, Moſes ſhould expreſs the ſame kind of religious veneration in a place, which God, by manifeſting himſelf in ſo extraordinary a manner, was pleaſed to render, pro tempore, a temple, or holy place. For the ſame reaſon Joſhua is commanded to pay the like homage before the "captain of the hoſt of the Lord (*b*);" who was undoubtedly "the angel of God's preſence, in whom his name is," even the divine Λογος: for it is ſaid, Joſhua "fell on his face to the earth, and worſhipped him (*c*)." This we cannot ſuppoſe he would have done, if he had

* Vid. Braun. ubi ſupra, cap. xxv. §. xi. p. 858,—861. edit. Amſtel. 1680. cap. xxvi. §. dccxx. p. 682,—683. edit. 1701.

(*a*) Exod. iii. 5. (*b*) Joſh. v. 15. (*c*) ver. 14.

had eſteemed him only a created angel, or that if he had done it, his worſhip would not have met with ſuch a rebuke, as the angel gave to St. John, "See thou do it not; for I am thy fellow-ſervant,—worſhip God (*a*)." The Jewiſh prieſts, according to the rabbies, were required to be ſuperſtitiouſly exact in this ceremony; for if any thing intervened between their feet and the ground, they imagined, their miniſtry would be null and invalid *.

It may not be improper, here, to remark, that as the Jews accounted it a token of reverence to have their feet bare in publick worſhip, ſo likewiſe to have their heads covered. This was accordingly the practiſe, not only of the prieſts, but of the people, as at this day it is, in token of their modeſty and humility, and of their accounting themſelves unworthy to look up in the more immediate preſence of God. Thus on the divine appearance to Moſes in the buſh, it is ſaid, "he hid his face, for he was afraid to look upon God (*b*)." And on the extraordinary manifeſtation of the divine preſence to Elijah, he "wrapped his face in his mantle (*c*)." On the ſame account, perhaps, the angels were repreſented in viſion to Iſaiah, as "covering their faces with their wings in the preſence of Jehovah (*d*);" to have the head uncovered, being eſteemed a mark of confidence. For which reaſon, in thoſe places, where the Iſraelites are ſaid to have "marched out of Egypt with an high hand," the chaldee

(*a*) Rev. xxii. 9.

* Vid. Miſh. tit. Zebhac. cap. ii. § 1. R. Bartenor. & Maimon. in loc. tom. 5. p. 10. edit. Surenhus. & Maimon. de ratione adeundi Templi, cap. v. §. xvii, xix. p. 202, 203. Crenii Faſciculi ſexti.

(*b*) Exod. iii. 6. (*c*) 1 Kings xix. 13. (*d*) Iſaiah iv. 2.

paraphraſt renders it "bare-headed," that is, with boldneſs and intrepidity.

The ancient Romans, likewiſe, performed their ſacred rites with a veil or covering on their heads, as appears from theſe lines in Virgil,

Quin, ubi tranſmiſſæ ſteterint trans æquora claſſes,
Et poſitis aris jam vota in littore ſolves;
Purpureo velare comas adopertus amictu:
Ne qua inter ſanctos ignes in honore Deorum
Hoſtilis facies occurrat, & omina turbet.
Æneid. 3. l. 403, &c.

Again,

Spes eſt pacis, ait. Tum numina ſancta precamur
Palladis armiſonæ, quæ prima accepit ovantes:
Et capita ante aras Phrygio velamur amictu.
Ibid. l. 543, &c.

The Grecians, on the contrary, performed the ſacred rites bareheaded. Illic (nempe in æde Saturni) Græco ritu, capite aperto, res divina fit, ſaith Macrobius *. St. Paul therefore writing to the Corinthians, who were Greeks, declares, that "every man praying, or propheſying, with his head covered, diſhoneureth his head (*a*);" thereby teaching us, that though the circumſtances of dreſs, as well as geſture, in divine worſhip are in themſelves indifferent; yet ſuch are proper to be uſed, as the cuſtom of

* Saturnal. lib. 1. cap. viii. p. 222, 223. edit. Gronov. Lugd. Bat. 1670.

(*a*) 1 Cor. xi. 4.

of the country where we dwell, has rendered ſignificative of humility and reverence.

5thly, The ſacerdotal veſtments are all ſuppoſed to have a moral and typical ſignification, though the more immediate deſign of them, eſpecially of the pontifical veſtes aureæ, was "for glory and for beauty (*a*)." For the whole ceremonial worſhip had "a ſhadow of good things to come (*b*);" and it is ſaid of the prieſts in particular, that they "ſerved unto the example and ſhadow of heavenly things (*c*)." Concerning the typical and ſpiritual meaning of theſe veſtments, as pretty commonly repreſented by Chriſtians, conſult Mather's ſermon on this ſubject in his "Types unveiled." As for the jews, they diſcover a world of philoſophy in them. Joſephus * makes the high-prieſt's linnen garment repreſent the body of the earth; the glorious robe, heaven; the bells and pomgranates, thunder and lightning. Or otherwiſe, the ephod of various colours is the univerſe; the breaſt-plate, the earth in its centre; the girdle, the ſea; the onyx ſtone on each ſhoulder, the ſun and moon; the twelve ſtones in the breaſt-plate, the twelve ſigns of the Zodiac, or the twelve months in the year; the mitre, heaven; and the golden plate with the name of God engraven on it, the ſplendor of the divine majeſty in heaven. Philo philoſophiſes on them in a ſimilar manner †.

(*a*) Exod. xxviii. 2. (*b*) Heb. x. 1. (*c*) chap. viii. 5.

* Antiq. lib. iii. cap. vii. §. ult. tom. 1. p. 156, 157. edit. Haverc.

† Philo. Jud. de Somniis, apud opera, p. 453, 454. de vitâ Moſis, lib. iii. p. 518,—521. de Monarch. lib. ii. p. 636, 637. edit. Colon. Allobr. 1613.

But the talmudical doctors aſſign them a more religious and moral ſignification; the eight garments denoting circumciſion, which was to be performed on the eighth day; and each garment being to expiate a particular ſin; the breeches uncleanneſs; the girdle, theft; the ephod, idolatry; the breaſt plate, perverſe judgment; the bells, evil ſpeaking; the mitre, and the golden plate on the forehead, pride and impudence *.

The Coccejan divines, who have great talents at allegorizing, find out in them, in a manner, all ſpiritual bleſſings and graces. Braunius in particular, makes the mitre ſignify wiſdom; the robe, righteouſneſs; the breeches, ſanctification; and the girdle, redemption: all which "Chriſt is made of God unto believers (a)." By the other veſtments are denoted the principal benefits of the goſpel; election and adoption, by the ephod and the pectoral; vocation, or effectual calling, by the bells; faith by the golden crown, &c †. Theſe divines, as well as ſome of the ancients have permitted their fancies to make excurſions beyond the bounds of reaſon and good ſenſe. Nevertheleſs thoſe who will admit of no typical meaning in any of theſe things, go into a contrary extreme. It will be happy, if we can hit the juſt medium, in attempting which the ſcripture will be our beſt guide.

Three

* Vid. Braun. de veſtitu ſacerd. hebræor. lib. ii. cap. xxvi. §. ix. x. p. 878,—881. edit. Amſtel. 1680. cap. xxvii. §. DCCXLV, DCCXLVI. p. 707,—709. edit. 1701.

(a) 1 Cor. i. 30.

† Ubi ſupra, §. xvi, xvii. p. 887,—889. edit. Amſtel. 1680. §. DCCLIII, DCCLIV. p. 713,—715. edit. 1701.

Three rites of the consecration both of the high-priest, and the common priests, their washing, anointing, and cloathing being considered, there remains a

4th, The offering certain sacrifices according to the prescription in the book of Exodus (a). These were a young bullock, and two rams; beside unleavened bread, cakes and wafers (b), the bullock for a sin offering, one ram for a burnt offering, both which were entirely consumed with fire (c): and the other ram and the bread in the nature of a peace offering, part only of which was consumed on the altar, and the rest eat by the priests, for whom the sacrifices were offered (d).

The first of these sacrifices, which was the sin offering, was to signify, that till their sins were expiated, they were not fit to perform any acceptable service, much less to offer sacrifice, or make atonement for the sins of the people.

The second, which was the holocaust, or whole burnt offering, was in the nature of a gift or present, whereby they were recommended to God.

The third was a peace offering, on which they made a feast, and by that were initiated into his family *.

The ram of the peace offering is called in the Hebrew אֵיל מִלֻּאִים eil milluim, aries impletionum (e) which Ainsworth renders "the ram of filling the hand;" because "the part, which was to be consumed on the altar, was first

(a) chap. xxix. (b) ver. 1, 2. (c) ver. 13, 14, 18. (d) ver. 19,—28.

* See Patrick on Exod. xxix. 10.

(e) ver. 22.

firſt put into the hands of Aaron, and into the hands of his ſons (*a*)."

Rabbi Solomon gives a different reaſon for the ram's being called איל מלאים eil milluim, from מלא malè, plenus vel completus eſt; becauſe the offering of this ſacrifice compleated the conſecration, and thereupon the prieſts were fully inveſted in their office. Accordingly the ſeptuagint renders מלאים milluim by τελειωσις conſummation; and hence perhaps the apoſtle, ſpeaking of Chriſt, under the character of a prieſt, ſaith, he is εις τον αιωνα τετελειωμενον (*b*), conſummated or perfected for ever.

Godwin takes particular notice of two circumſtances in theſe ſacrifices.

1ſt, That ſome of the blood of the ram of conſecration was put upon the tip of the right ear, and the thumb of the right hand, and the great toe of the right foot, of the prieſts who were conſecrated (*c*). Probably it was put upon their ear, as denoting the attention they eſpecially ought to give to God's word, that they might be thoroughly inſtructed in the duties of their office, and be fit to be teachers of others; for attention to the word of God, or care and diligence in learning his mind and will, is expreſſed by "opening the ear (*d*)."

The touching the right thumb with the ſame blood was to ſignify, that they were to attend with diligence on the work of their miniſtry; which is called "the work of their hands (*e*)." This phraſe is expreſſive of any ſort of active ſervice. It is ſaid in the Acts, that "by the hands of the apoſtles were many ſigns and wonders

(*a*) ver. 24. (*b*) Heb. vii. 28. (*c*) Exod. xxix. 20. (*d*) Job xxxvi. 10. Iſa. l. 5. (*e*) Deut. xxxiii. 11.

ders wrought among the people (*a*);" though ſome of theſe were wrought only by ſpeaking (*b*); and others, by their ſhadow overſhadowing the diſeaſed (*c*).

Since the right hand only was conſecrated by the ſacrifical blood, the rabbies ſay, if a prieſt made uſe of his left, inſtead of his right in performing any part of the ſervice, it polluted it.*

The touching of the great toe with the blood is ſuppoſed to ſignify, that they ought to take great heed, that their converſation might be holy, without blame, and ſuch as became the miniſters of God: for the converſation is frequently expreſſed by walking (*d*). And the application of the ſacrifical blood to all theſe parts of the body, was doubtleſs intended to denote, that all muſt be ſanctified and rendered acceptable to God by the blood of Chriſt.

The other circumſtance which our author remarks is, that "at the conſecration of the prieſts, certain pieces of the ſacrifices were put into their hands;" as was before obſerved. On which account their conſecration itſelf is expreſſed by "filling their hands (*e*)," ומלאת את־ידים umilleath eth-jadham, & implebis manum eorum. Our author from hence derives the cuſtom in the church of England, or as he is pleaſed to expreſs it in the chriſtian church, of the biſhop's giving a bible into the hand of the miniſter to be ordained; "BOTH WHICH, he ſaith, may ſignify, that no man taketh that honour

(*a*) Acts v. 12. (*b*) ver. 5. (*c*) ver. 15, 16.
* Miſhn. & Bartenor, & Maimon. in loc. ubi ſupra. Maimon. de ratione adeundi Temple, ubi ſupra, §. xviii.
(*d*) Pſal. i. 1. xv. 2. Prov. x. 9. Iſa. xxxiii. 15. Phil. iii. 17. Gal. ii. 14. and in many other places, both of the Old and New Teſtament. (*e*) Exod. xxviii. 41.

honour to himſelf, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron;" and adds, "Contrary to this did Jeroboam's prieſts, whoever would, he filled his own hands (*a*):" that is, "he thruſt himſelf into the prieſthood." I hope our author did not intend this compariſon to Jeroboam's prieſts for a reflexion on all miniſters not epiſcopally ordained according to the rites of the engliſh eſtabliſhment. However, I beg leave, to obſerve, that the words in Kings מִלֵּא יָדוֹ בְּכָל־הַבָּא אֵלָיו לְהַכְהֵן, lechaphers jemalle ethjadho, ſhould rather be rendered, Ejus qui voluit implevit manum, that is, Jeroboam filled the hand of him that would. Yet, becauſe our king appoints to the epiſcopal office, whom he pleaſes, far be it from me to compare our biſhops to Jeroboam's prieſts.

Godwin remarks ſome peculiarities, by which the high-prieſt was diſtinguiſhed from the common prieſts.

1ſt, He muſt marry none but a virgin (*b*). Therefore, he was exempt from the law of marrying his brother's widow, in caſe he died without children (*c*). Our author ſays, another prieſt may lawfully marry a widow; and Joſephus ſays the ſame *. But there is no ſuch expreſs permiſſion in the law; only it is, inferred from a widow's not being mentioned among thoſe whom a common prieſt is forbid to marry (*d*). Nevertheleſs Grotius is of opinion, the common prieſts had not this liberty, unleſs with reſpect to the widows of prieſts. This he grounds on the following paſſage of Ezekiel,

(*a*) 1 Kings xiii. 33. (*b*) Lev. xxi. 13, 14. (*c*) Deut. xxv. 5.

* Antiq. lib. iii. cap. xii. §. 2. tom. 1. p. 183. edit. Haverc. (*d*) Lev. xxi. 7.

Ezekiel, "Neither ſhall they (that is, any prieſts) take for their wives a widow, or her that is put away; but they ſhall take maidens of the ſeed of the houſe of Iſrael, or a widow that had a prieſt before (*a*)." However, it is certain the high-prieſt might marry none but a virgin; and the rabbies have determined the age ſhe muſt be, at the time of her marriage, within leſs than half a year, betwixt twelve years old and a day, and twelve years and a half. For they obſerve, ſhe muſt not only be a virgin בְּתוּלָה bethulah, but he muſt marry her before ſhe comes to the age of puberty, בִּבְתוּלֶיהָ bibthuleiha, in her virginity; which, they ſay, was circumſcribed within the ſhort period I have mentioned *.

We may further obſerve, they are much more liberal to the king than to the prieſt; allowing the former eighteen wives, the latter, but one; at leaſt if he did take another, they ſay, he muſt give a bill of divorce to one of them before the great day of expiation, otherwiſe he would be incapable of performing the ſervices then required †.

2dly, The high prieſt muſt not mourn for the death of his neareſt kindred. He "ſhall not uncover his head, nor rent his clothes; neither ſhall he go in to any dead body, nor defile himſelf for his father, or for his mother. Neither ſhall he go out of the ſanctuary, nor profane the ſanctuary of his God (*b*)." The ceremonies of mourning, here prohibited, are ſuch,

(*a*) Ezek. xliv. 22. See Grotii Annot. ad Lev. xxi. 14.

* Vid. Selden. uxor. hebr. lib. ii. cap. 7. oper. vol. 2. tom. 2. p. 555, 556.

† Selden. ubi ſupra, cap. 8. p. 561, 562.

(*b*) Lev. xxi. 10,—12.

ſuch, as would not conſiſt with his attending the ſervice of the ſanctuary, and the reaſon of the law is, that the publick worſhip of God, in which the preſence and miniſtration of the high-prieſt was in many caſes neceſſary, might not be interrupted.

The ceremonies, forbidden, are

1ſt, Uncovering his head. The ſeptuagint renders ראשו לא יפרע roſhu lo jiphrang, την κεφαλην ου ἀποκαλυψεται, caput non nudabit cidari; or if I may be allowed the expreſſion, he ſhall not unmitre his head: a phraſe, which, though it is not an exact tranſlation, does not improperly convey the true deſign of the law, which was, to prevent his omitting the duties of his office on occaſion of the death even of his neareſt relations; which he muſt have done, if he had complied with the cuſtom of uncovering his head, or laying aſide his mitre, that being one of the holy garments, without which it was unlawful for him to officiate (*a*). The chaldee paraphraſe renders the word very differently from the ſeptuagint: in capite ſuo non nutriat comam. Ainſworth ſaith, the hebrew word פרע pharang, ſignifies, both to make bare and to make free; Onkelos, it ſeems, taking it in the latter ſenſe, underſtands the meaning of the law to be, that the hair ſhould not be left to grow free, without trimming. In this manner, we are told by Herodotus, the Egyptians uſed to expreſs their mourning for the dead *; letting the hair grow long, and in a negligent form, being conſidered as a mark of inattention to themſelves, through exceſſive grief.

(*a*) Exod. xxviii. 36,—38.

* Herodot. Euterp. cap. 36. p. 101. edit. Gronov. Ludg. Bat. 1715.

grief. Mephiboſheth was in ſuch deep concern for David on account of Abſalom's rebellion, that "he neither trimmed his beard, nor waſhed his cloaths, from the day the king departed from Jeruſalem, until the day he came again in peace (*a*)." If we underſtand the law according to the ſenſe of Onkelos, it is either deſigned to prevent the high-prieſt's ſymbolizing with the Heathens, in the rites of mourning, or to preſerve decency in publick worſhip, it not being fit that the chief miniſter in the ſanctuary ſhould appear with his hair long and neglected, as mourners ſometimes did.

However both among the Jews and the neighbouring nations, it was a more uſual ſign of mourning, not only to uncover, but even to ſhave their heads. When Job was informed of his repeated loſſes, and of the death of his children, "he rent his mantle, and ſhaved his head (*b*)." And in the prophecy of Jeremiah we read of fourſcore men who were going to lament the deſolation of Jeruſalem, having their beards ſhaven, and their cloaths rent (*c*). That this was uſual among the Perſians appears from the following paſſage of Quintus Curtius: Perſæ, comis ſuo more detonſis, in lugubri veſte, cum conjugibus ac liberis, (Alexandrum) non ut victorem, & modo hoſtem, ſed ut gentis ſuæ juſtiſſimum regem vero deſiderio lugebant *." And that the ſame rites was in uſe among other nations, appears from Suetonius in his life of Caligula, where, after obſerving, that on the death of Cæſar Germanicus, ſome barbarous nations at war among

(*a*) 2 Sam. xix. 24. (*b*) Job i. 20. (*c*) Jer. xli. 5.

* Quint. Curt. de geſtis Alexand. lib. x. cap. v. §. 17. p. 785. edit. Ludg. Bat. 1696.

among themselves, and with the Romans, agreed to a cessation of hostilities, as if their grief had been of a domestic nature, and on an occasion which alike concerned them both, he adds, Regulos quosdam (ferunt) barbam posuisse & uxorum capita rasisse, ad indicium maximi luctûs *.

We meet with frequent references to this rite of mourning in scripture. In the prophet Jeremiah: "Cut off thy hair, O Jerusalem; take up a lamentation (*a*)." In the prophet Micah: Make thee bald, and poll thee for thy delicate children; for they are gone into captivity (*b*)." In Isaiah: "The Lord shall shave with a razor, that is hired, namely, by them beyond the river, by the king of Assyria, the head, and the hair of the feet; and it shall also consume the beard:" referring to the Assyrian captivity (*c*). And by the same prophet baldness is mentioned among the signs of mourning (*d*). And so by Jeremiah: "every head shall be bald, and every beard clipt." Which is thus explained, "There shall be lamentation generally, upon all the house tops of Moab (*e*)." And once more, "Neither shall men lament for them, nor cut themselves, nor make themselves bald for them (*f*)." Upon the whole then, the prohibition of the high-priest's uncovering his head for the dead probably means, not only that he must not appear without his mitre, but that he must not shave his head; nor yet on the other hand let his hair grow long and neglected. Both these extremes are

* In vitâ Calig. cap. v. §. 3, 4. tom. 1. p. 768. edit. Pitisci. Traject ad Rhen. 1990.

(*a*) Jer. vii. 29. (*b*) Mic. i. 16. (*c*) Isa. vii. 20. (*d*) chap. xxii. 12. (*e*) Jer. xlviii. 37, 38. (*f*) Jer. xvi. 6.

are expreſsly prohibited: "Neither ſhall they, that is, the prieſts, ſhave their heads, nor ſuffer their locks to grow long (*a*)."

2dly, The high-prieſt muſt not rent his cloaths, in token of mourning for the dead; which was anciently much practiſed by the Jews and other nations. Quintus Curtius ſaith, that when Darius was on the point of being ſeized by Beſſus and the Bactrians, in order to be delivered up to Alexander, and the only domeſtick left about him made ſuch loud lamentations as alarmed the camp, irrupere deinde alii laceratiſque veſtibus, lugubri & barbaro ululatu regem deplorare cœperunt *. Virgil ſays of Amata, that apprehending Turnus was dead,

Se cauſam clamat, crimenque caputque malorum,
Multaque per mœſtum demens effata furorem,
Purpureos moritura manu diſcindit amictus,
Et nodum informis lethi trabe nectit ab altâ.
Æneid. 12. l. 600,—603.

And Latinus her huſband, hearing of her unhappy fate,

——It ſciſſâ veſte Latinus
Conjugis attonitus fatis urbiſque ruina.
l. 609, 610.

So Juvenal, deſcribing the funeral rites, with which Priam would have been honoured, had he died before Paris committed the rape of Helen, ſaith,

Incolumi

(*a*) Ezek. xliv. 20.

* Quint. Curt. de geſtis Alexand. Magn. lib. v. cap. 12. §. 12. p. 358. edit. Ludg. Bat. 1696.

Incolumi Trojâ Priamus veniſſet ad umbras
Aſſaraci magnis ſolemnibus, Hectore funus
Portante, ac reliquis fratrum cervicibus, inter
Iliadum lacrymas, ut primos edere planctus
Caſſandra inciperet, ſciſſâque Polyxena palla.
Satyr. x. l. 258, 262.

We have this rite of mourning frequently mentioned in ſcripture, as practiſed on various occaſions; particularly, on the death of relations or friends, as by Reuben and his father Jacob on the ſuppoſed death of Joſeph (*a*); and by David on the death of Saul and Jonathan (*b*): ſometimes it was practiſed on account of great injuries received, as by Tamar, when ſhe had been abuſed by her brother Amnon (*c*): or on account of the infliction or denunciation of publick judgments; for which reaſon it is mentioned as a ſign of great ſtupidity in king Jehoiakim and his courtiers, that when they read in a roll of Jeremiah's prophecy, what judgments God threatned to bring upon the nations, "they were not afraid, nor rent their garments (*d*)." Again it was practiſed, when they heard blaſphemy or any other profane contempt of God, as by king Hezekiah and his officers, when they heard the blaſphemous railing of Rabſhakeh (*e*). The rabbies indeed ſay, it was to be practiſed only on hearing blaſphemy from one of their own nation, and therefore they conclude Rabſhakeh was an apoſtate Jew *. In this way they expreſſed

(*a*) Gen. xxxvii. 29,—34. (*b*) 2 Sam. i 11. (*c*) 2 Sam. xiii. 19. (*d*) Jer. xxxvi. 24. (*e*) Iſa. xxxvi. 22. and chap. xxxvii. 1.

* In libro Præceptorum. See the paſſage quoted by Druſius, on Matt. xxvi. 65,

preſſed their deteſtation of either words or actions that were affrontive to the deity. When, therefore, the prieſt and people at Lyſtra would have paid divine honours to Paul and Barnabas, "they rent their cloaths (*a*)." And this Caiaphas did, when our Saviour declared himſelf to be the ſon of God; on which account he charged him with blaſphemy (*b*). Upon this a queſtion has been ſtarted, whether, he did not herein act contrary to the law in Leviticus, which, in two places under a ſevere penalty forbids the high-prieſt rending his cloaths (*c*). Grotius obſerves, the occaſion in both caſes was the death of relations, and that there is no expreſs prohibition which extends to any other occaſion *. Beſides, theſe were both very peculiar and extraordinary caſes. The one was, the death of Nadab and Abihu by the immediate hand of God, for offering ſtrange fire on the altar; when neither their father nor their brethren were permitted to ſhew any ſign of mourning, leſt it ſhould look like arraigning the divine juſtice; and perhaps it might be intended as an additional puniſhment to them, that they ſhould not only be ſtruck dead, but die unlamented. The latter prohibition (*d*) is in the caſe of the prieſt's daughter playing the harlot, for which ſhe was to be burnt with fire (*e*); and then it follows, he, that is, the high-prieſt, ſhall not uncover his head, nor rent his cloaths; becauſe, on ſuch an occaſion, it would look like a reflection on the legiſlator, or on the law itſelf. However, if the prohibition be ſuppoſed

(*a*) Acts xiv. 14. (*b*) Matt. xxvi. 65. (*c*) Lev. x. 6. and chap. xxi. 10.

* Agreeable to the chaldee paraphraſt in loc.

(*d*) chap. xxi. 10. (*e*) ver. 9.

to extend to all caſes, it probably related to the ſacerdotal veſtments only, which were not to be rent on any occaſion *. And ſo it is certain the Jews in later ages underſtood it; for it is ſaid in the firſt book of Maccabees (*a*), that Jonathan the high-prieſt, on the defeat and flight of his army, "rent his cloaths." And in Joſephus we are informed, that to appeaſe a popular commotion, excited by the cruelties of Florus, procurator of Judea, the principal perſons, and particularly the high-prieſts, rent their garments, τας ἐσθητας περιερρηξαντο, and on their knees beſought the people not to puſh things to extremity, leſt the conſequence ſhould be their ruin. And when the tumult which was thus allayed, was like to be revived, they had recourſe to the ſame expedient, τοτε δε ἀρχιερεις αυτος ην ἰδων καταμωμενος μεν της κεφαλης κοπτω, γυμνους δε τα σεφη των ἐσθητων περιερρηξαμενον †. The rabbies ſay, the high-prieſt was allowed to rent his cloaths at the bottom, but not from the top to the bottom ‡, which was the common way. They tell us moreover, that it muſt be done ſtanding, which they ground on the example of David who, it is ſaid, on a report that Abſalom had ſlain all his brethren, aroſe and tore his garments (*b*). They add, that the rent muſt not be more than a hand's breadth, and that it muſt be made in the

* Selden. de jure natur. & gent. lib. ii. cap. 12. oper. vol. 1. tom. 1. p. 271, 272.

(*a*) Chap. xi. 71.

† De bello Judaic. lib. ii. cap. xv. §. 2, 4. edit. Haverc.

‡ Miſhn. tit Horajoth, cap. 3. §. 5. tom. iv. p. 501. edit. Surenhus.

(*b*) 2 Sam. xiii. 31.

the upper garment, and in the fore part of it *.

The third peculiarity of the high-prieſt, conſiſted in his preſiding over the inferior prieſts in taking care that all things were conducted with decency, and according to the law, and in performing himſelf ſome appropriate parts of the divine ſervice.

Godwin ſaith, that both the high-prieſt and the inferior prieſts burnt incenſe, and offered ſacrifices (*a*), and even ſlew the victims (*b*); that they both ſounded the trumpet, either for an alarm in war, or to aſſemble the people, and their rulers (*c*); that they both inſtructed the people (*d*), and both judged and determined concerning leproſy (*e*): and he might have added, concerning caſes of adultery by the waters of jealouſy (*f*); and concerning things vowed or devoted, the former being redeemable at a valuation, or price ſet by the prieſt, the latter, not (*g*).

It belonged likewiſe to the prieſts to ſet on and remove the ſhew-bread, to tend and ſupply the lamps (*h*), to burn the red heifer (*i*), to bleſs the people (*k*), and to keep watch in three ſeveral places of the temple (*l*) No doubt the high-prieſt had power or authority in virtue of his office, to perform any part of the ſacerdotal ſervice, and ſeveral of the articles already mentioned are expreſsly declared to pertain to him

* Vid. Maimon. de luctu, cap. 8. §. 1, 2.

(*a*) 1 Chron. vi. 49. (*b*) 2 Chron. xxix. 22. (*c*) Num. x. 1,—8. (*d*) Lev. x. 11. Deut. xvii. 8,—12. Mal. ii. 7. (*e*) Lev. xiii. 2. (*f*) Numb. v. 19. (*g*) Lev. xxvii. 8, 28. (*h*) Lev. xxiv. 1,—9. (*i*) Numb. xix. 2. (*k*) Numb. vi. 23,—27. (*l*) 2 Chron. xxiii. 4.

as well as to the inferior prieſts; however ſome of the more laborious parts of the ſervice, were ordinarily performed by the inferior prieſts under his direction.

On the other hand he had his peculiar province, the principal branches of which were enquiring of the Lord, and giving anſwers by Urim and Thummim, and performing the moſt holy parts of the divine ſervice, eſpecially on the great annual faſt, or day of expiation; when cloathed in his linnen garments, he went alone into the holy of holies; and there burnt incenſe and ſprinkled ſome of the blood of the ſacrifice upon the mercy ſeat (*a*).

The duties of his office on that day will be conſidered in their place, when we are treating of the jewiſh feſtivals.

It is however proper, here to take notice of what our author obſerves concerning the high-prieſt's ſuffragan or deputy, called סָגָן ſagan, as ſome write it, or as others שָׂגָן ſagen; who, in caſe of the high-prieſt's incapacity by ſickneſs or any legal uncleaneſs, diſcharged his office for him. The word סָגָן ſagan, in the ſingular number, is never uſed in ſcripture; but the plural סְגָנִים ſeganim, ſeveral times occurs, and ſeems always to import ſecular rulers or governors; as particularly in the book of Nehemiah, where the סְגָנִים ſeganim, are joined with the nobles, and are not improperly called rulers in the engliſh verſion (*b*). In Iſaiah (*c*), we ſtile them princes; and Daniel is ſaid to be made chief of the ſeganim, which we there render governors (*d*). And certain it is, his was

(*a*) Lev. xvi. throughout, and Heb. ix. 7.
(*b*) Nehem. iv. 14,—19. (*c*) Iſa. xli. 25.
(*d*) Dan. ii. 48.

was not an eccleſiaſtical, but civil office. So that in all thoſe places, and wherever elſe the word occurs in the hebrew bible, it evidently imports ſecular dignity and authority. Nevertheleſs the ſingular noun Sagan is often uſed by the hebrew doctors for an eccleſiaſtical perſon. The targum of Jonathan, on the ſecond book of Kings, renders the prieſt of the ſecond order, "the ſagan of the prieſts (*a*), and calls "Zephaniah, the ſecond prieſt," the ſagan (*b*). And in the prophecy of Jeremiah it in one place ſtiles him (*c*), and in another, Paſhur (*d*), the ſagan of the prieſts. It is agreed on all hands that the ſagan was next to the high-prieſt, and his vicegerent; but for what end he was appointed, and what were the duties of his office is diſputed. One opinion, eſpouſed by Cunæus *, is, that he was only to officiate for the high-prieſt, in caſe he was rendered incapable of attending the ſervice through ſickneſs, or legal uncleaneſs, on the day of expiation. Joſephus gives an inſtance of the ſervice of that day being performed by one Joſeph the ſon of Eli, as deputy or ſagan of the high-prieſt Matthias, who the night before had been accidently rendered unclean †; and Mr. Selden ‡ informs us, out of the Jeruſalem and babyloniſh talmud, that Simeon the high-prieſt being rendered unclean by ſome drops of ſpittle falling on his garments the day before, his brother Judah officiated as his ſagan on the

(*a*) On 2 Kings xxiii. 4. (*b*) On 2 Kings xxv. 18.
(*c*) Jer. lii. 24. (*d*) Jer. xx. 1.
* De repub. Hebr. lib. ii. cap. vi.
† Antiq. lib. xvii. cap. vi. §. 4. edit. Havere.
‡ De ſucceſſ. in Pontificat. lib. i. cap. xii. apud opera, vol. 1. tom. 1. p. 145, 146. Londini, 1720.

day of expiation. The patrons of this opinion tell us, the ſagan was appointed the preceding evening, and for the ſervice of that day only. So that, according to them, there was a new ſagan every year; or at leaſt, he was appointed anew to his office. The miſhnical book Joma * tells us farther, that they not only appointed a ſagan for the high-prieſt, in caſe he ſhould be polluted; but likewiſe a wife in caſe his wife ſhould die on that day, or the night before. For it is ſaid, "He ſhall make atonement for himſelf, and for his houſe (*a*)." Now a houſe, it is ſaid, implies a wife, which therefore he muſt not be without on that day.

After all, the ſagan's officiating for the high-prieſt on the day of expiation has no foundation in ſcripture, by which no man is allowed to officiate in the holy of holies but the high-prieſt; and if therefore, he was ſick, or otherwiſe diſabled, that part of the ſervice muſt, no doubt, be omitted; which in caſe of neceſſity it might be without ſuch bad conſequence as the rabbies apprehend, who make the efficacy of all the ſacrifices of the enſuing year to depend upon it.

Others think the ſagan was the high-prieſt's vicar or ſuffragan, to aſſiſt him in the care of (and in his abſence to overſee) the affairs of the temple and the ſervice of the prieſts. Dr. Lightfoot, in ſupport of this opinion, obſerves †, that the ſagan is commonly called both in the targum ‡, and by the rabbies סגן

* Cap. §. 1. tom. 2. p. 206. edit. Surenhus.

(*a*) Lev. xvi. 6.

† Temple ſervice, chap. 5. §. 1. and Horæ hebraicæ on Luke iii. 2.

‡ See Targum Jonathan in 2 Kings xxv. 18. and Jer. lii. 24.

סגן הכהנים ſagan haccoanim, the ſagan of the prieſts; which ſeems to import, that his office referred as much, (if not more,) to the common prieſts, as to the high-prieſt. Maimonides in particular ſays *, "all the prieſts were at the command of the ſagan." According to this opinion, his office was not for a day only, but probably for life; at leaſt, till he became ſuperannuated, or till the high-prieſt's death. Some ſay he was always heir apparent to the high-prieſthood, and that none could be high-prieſt, who had not firſt been ſagan †. To this Dr. Lightfoot objects, not only that it could not be the caſe under the ſecond temple, and after the days of Herod, when the pontifical dignity was at the arbitrary diſpoſal of the roman preſidents, who preferred to it whom they pleaſed; but even in earlier ages, when the ſucceſſion was legal and regular, we dont find that he, whom the targum calls ſagan, always ſucceeded on a demiſe. There is not the leaſt intimation, that Zephaniah, who in the ſecond book of kings is called the ſecond prieſt or ſagan, was the ſon of Seraiah the high-prieſt, or ſucceeded him in his office (*a*).

Upon the whole, it is probable, that he who was next in the ſucceſſion to the high-prieſthood was for the moſt part appointed ſagan, but not always; ſince it required a perſon of learning and experience in the laws and ritual to aſſiſt the high-prieſt, eſpecially if he were a

* Maimon. de apparatu templi, cap. iv. §. xvi. apud Crenii Faſcicul. ſext. p. 115.

† R. Solom. in Numb. xix. and Talmud Hieroſolym, quoted in Lightfoot's temple-ſervice, chap. 4.

(*a*) 2 Kings xxv. 18.

weak man; and therefore it is likely they regarded merit rather then birth in the choice and appointment of this officer.

The divine inſtitution of him is conceived to be in the following paſſage of the book of Numbers, "Eleazar, the ſon of Aaron the prieſt, ſhall be chief over the chief of the Levites, and have the overſight of them, that keep the charge of the ſanctuary (*a*)." Thus, it appears, there were ſome among the prieſts and Levites, who had pre-eminence and authority over their brethren; each, perhaps, being an overſeer to a certain number, or preſiding in a particular branch of the ſervice of the ſanctuary; but Eleazer was chief over theſe chiefs. Hence, ſays Ainſworth*, ariſes the diſtinction of the high-prieſt, and the ſecond prieſt. And when Aaron was dead, and Eleazar, the ſecond prieſt, was high-prieſt in his room (*b*), then Phinehas, Eleazar's ſon, ſucceeded him in the office of ſecond prieſt, or governor over the Levites; for "Phinehas the ſon of Eleazar is ſaid in the firſt book of Chronicles to have been ruler over them, that is, the Levites, in time paſt (*c*)."

From hence it ſhould ſeem, the hint was firſt taken of appointing, beſides biſhops, who have the overſight of the prieſts in particular dioceſes, archbiſhops, who have the overſight of the biſhops of ſeveral dioceſes, or are "chief of the chiefs." But the New Teſtament is totally ſilent concerning ſuch an inſtitution for the government of the chriſtian church.

The

(*a*) Numb. iii. 32.
* In loc.
(*b*) Numb. xx. 26, 28. (*c*) 1 Chron. ix. 20.

The rabbies ſpeak of three other ſorts of ſacerdotal officers, ſuperior to common prieſts, but inferior to the high-prieſt and ſagan; כתוליקין Katholikin, אמרכלין Immarcalin, and גזברין Gizbarim.

These were two Katholikin of whom Maimonides * gives this ſhort account, that they were to the ſagan, as the ſagan to the high-prieſt, namely, ſubſtitutes and aſſiſtants, and next in place and honour. According to other hebrew writers their office related to the treaſuries of the temple, and to the management of the revenues, ariſing from the oblations.

The Immarkalin were ſeven, who carried the keys of the ſeven gates of the court, and one could not open them without the reſt †. According to which account, each gate muſt have ſeven different locks, the keys of which were ſeverally kept by the ſeven Immarkalin. Some of the rabbies tell us, there were ſeven rooms at the ſeven gates; in which the ſacred veſſels and veſtments were kept, under the care of theſe officers ‡.

The Gizbarin were not to be leſs then three, who were a ſort of treaſurers or collectors of the offerings brought to the temple §, which they accounted for to the Immarkalin, and they to the Katholikin, and all under the inſpection of the high-prieſt and ſagan. But having no mention of theſe officers in the ſacred ſcriptures,

* De apparatu templi, cap. iv. §. xvii.

† Maimon. de apparatu templi, ubi ſupra.

‡ Joſeph. ad Shekalim, cap. 5. R. Solom. in 2 Kings xii.

§ Maimon. de apparatu templi, cap. iv. §. xviii. ubi ſupra.

scriptures, we shall enter into no further particulars concerning them *.

We proceed to speak of the inferior priests. These were grown so numerous in David's time, that it became very inconvenient for them to attend the service at the tabernacle all together. He, therefore, divided them into twenty-four companies, who were to serve in rotation, each company by itself, for a week (a). That he did this by divine appointment, appears from the following passage, "David gave to Solomon his son the pattern of all that he had by the spirit, of the courts of the house of the Lord; also for the courses מחלקות machlekoth, of the priests and the Levites (b)." These courses are here called מחלקות machlekoth, from חלק chalak, divisit; and in Nehemiah, משמרות mishmaroth, from שמר shamar, custodivit (c). The septuagint renders both these words by ἐφημερίαι, in which they are followed by St. Luke, who saith that Zechariah the priest, the father of John the Baptist, was ἐξ ἐφημερίας Ἀβιὰ, of the course of Abia (d). The word, ἐφημερία, is derived from the form of the athenian republick. The country of Attica was divided into ten φυλαὶ, or tribes; fifty persons were chosen out of each tribe, who composed the senate; and each fifty sat and governed for one day in their turns. Hence their ἀρχὴ, or form of government, was called ἐφημερίαι; because their governors were daily changed according to a regular rotation †. Now there being a considerable resemblance

* See Lightfoot's temple service, ubi supra.

(a) 1 Chron. xxiv. throughout. (b) 1 Chron. xxviii. 11,—13. (c) Nehem. xiii. 30. (d) Luke i. 5.

† Vid. Joseph. Scaliger. de emendatione tempor. lib. i. p. 25 and 62, 63.

ſemblance betwixt this diviſion and ſucceſſion of the attick ſenators, and that of the jewiſh prieſts, the ſeptuagint applies the word ἐφημερία to the courſes of the prieſts; though ſomewhat improperly, becauſe they ſhifted not daily but weekly, as is concluded from its being ſaid in Chronicles, that the porters of the gate were relieved by their brethren every ſeven days (*a*); and if the inferior officers relieved one another weekly, it is reaſonable to ſuppoſe the prieſts did ſo too. There is the more reaſon for this concluſion, becauſe the courſes of the prieſts and of the porters are mentioned together in the account of Solomon's confirming the regulation which his father David had made: "He appointed according to the order of David his father, the courſes of the prieſts to their ſervice, and the Levites to their charge, the porters alſo by their courſes at every gate (*b*)." The time of ſhifting the courſes ſeems to have been the ſabbath; for the prieſts are deſcribed by this periphraſis, "Thoſe that enter in on the ſabbath (*c*)." So that each courſe attended the ſervice of the ſanctuary, for a week, twice a year.

The jewiſh writers ſay the firſt circulation of the courſes began on the firſt ſabbath of the month Niſan, anſwering to our March and April; and the ſecond on the firſt ſabbath of the month Tizri, anſwering to our September and October; and ſo they make two circulations to compleat the Year. But whereas there were but twenty-four courſes, which therefore in this double circulation would fill up only forty-

(*a*) 1 Chron. ix. 25. (*b*) 2 Chron. viii. 14.
(*c*) 2 Kings xi. 5.

forty-eight weeks, or eleven months, they say the weeks of the three great feasts were not taken into this account, for then all the courses attended, being all obliged by the law to appear before the Lord (a). If so, the double circulation of the twenty-four courses would very near compleat the jewish year.

Each course had its respective head, or chief. These are called, "chief men of the houses of their fathers;" of whom there were sixteen, and consequently sixteen courses, of the posterity of Eleazar, and eight of the posterity of Ithamar (b). These chiefs of their respective divisions were called שרי הקדש sare haccodaim, princes, or chiefs, of the priests (c). These were probably the ἀρχιερεῖς, or chief priests so often mentioned in the New Testament (d). These chief priests are, in several places, mentioned together with the elders, scribes and phatisees of chief note, as being fellow members of the sanhedrim, the supreme court of judicature.

The order in which the several courses were to serve, was determined by lot (e); and each course was, in all succeding ages, called by the name of its chief at the time of its first division. Thus Zecharias is said to be of the course of Abia, the eighth course; of which Abijah, or Abia, was the chief in David's time (f). And Josephus says *, he himself was of the first course, or the course of Jehoiarib upon whom the first lot fell (g). As

(a) Exod. xxiii. 17. (b) 1 Chron. xxiv. 4. (c) Ezra viii. 24. chap. x. 5. (d) Matt. xvi. 21. xxvii. 12, 41. John vii. 32. xviii. 3. Acts iv. 14. &c. (e) 1 Chron. xxiv. 5. (f) ver. 10.

* Joseph. vita, ab initio. (g) ver. 7.

As the great number of the ſacerdotal order occaſioned their being firſt divided into twenty-four companies, ſo in after times the number of each company grew too large for them all to miniſter together; for there were no leſs, according to Joſephus, than five thouſand prieſts in one courſe, in his time*. The jewiſh writers, therefore, tell us, that the miniſtry of each courſe was divided according to the number of the houſes of their fathers that were contained in it †. For inſtance, if a courſe conſiſted of five ſuch houſes, three ſerved three days, and the other two, two days apiece. If it contained ſix, five ſerved five days; and the other, two days. If it contained ſeven, the prieſts of each houſe ſerved a day ‡. And they further inform us, that the particular branches of the ſervice were aſſigned by lot to each prieſt, whoſe turn it was to attend on the miniſtry; as who ſhould kill the ſacrifices, who ſprinkle the blood, who burn the incenſe, &c §. Thus St. Luke tells us, that "according to the cuſtom of the prieſts office, it was the lot of Zacharias to burn incenſe, when he went into the temple of the Lord (a)." The rabbies ſay, but four of the courſes returned from the captivity, thoſe mentioned in Ezra, namely, "the children of Jedaiah of the houſe of Joſhua, the children

* Joſeph. contra Appion. cap. 2. vol. 2. p. 477. edit. Havercamp.

† Maimon. de apparatu templi, cap. iv. §. xi. p. 113. Crenii Faſcicul. text.

‡ Talmud. Hieros. in Taanith. cap. 4. & Thoſaph ad loc. See the paſſage quoted by Lightfoot, Temple ſervice, chap. vi. ſub fine.

§ Miſhn. Tamidh, cap. 3. §. 1. tom. v. p. 291. edit. Surenhus.

(a) Luke i. 9.

children of Immer, the children of Paſhur, and the children of Harim (*a*)." And they tell us, in what manner the prieſts were divided by lot into twenty four courſes, which were ſtill called by the ancient names *. But it may be objected to this account, that Paſhur was not the ancient head, or name, of any of the twenty-four courſes, and that in the catalogue of the prieſts who returned from the captivity which we have in the twelfth chapter of Nehemiah, there are the names of ſeveral others of the chiefs or heads of the courſes, beſides the three mentioned by Ezra; as Shecaniah, who was the head of the tenth courſe; Abijah, the head of the eighth; Bilgah, the head of the fifteenth, and Jojarib, who was the head of the firſt courſe. It is probable, that the chief of each courſe was always called by the name of him who was its chief at its firſt diviſion in the days of David.

Not only were the prieſts divided into twenty-four courſes, but the Levites, and indeed the whole people of Iſrael; as will be ſeen when we come to ſpeak of the viri ſtationarii, whom our author mentions towards the cloſe of this chapter.

The Levites, being, in the larger ſenſe of the word, the poſterity of the patriarch Levi, the third ſon of Jacob by Leah, were one of the twelve tribes of Iſrael; but in a more reſtrained and peculiar ſenſe, they were a lower order of eccleſiaſtical perſons, inferior to the prieſts, and their aſſiſtants in the ſacred ſervice. In this ſubordinate capacity, were all the

(*a*) Ezra ii. 36,—39.

* Talmud. Hieroſ. & Thoſaph. ad Taanith, ubi ſupra.

the males of the tribe of Levi, beſide the family of Aaron who were the prieſts; and it is very obſervable, that the poſterity of Moſes were no more then common Levites, while the deſcendants of his brother Aaron were advanced, by the appointment of his law, to the dignity of the prieſthood (*a*) A plain evidence that Moſes was influenced by no worldly or ambitious views, or rather that he was not the contriver and author of the law which he gave to Iſrael, but received it from God; for had he framed it, it is natural to ſuppoſe, he would have made ſome better proviſion, than he did, for his ſons, and for the grandeur of his houſe, and not have advanced his brother's above his own.

Indeed the Levites were appointed to the ſervice of the ſanctuary by God himſelf for the following reaſon.

When he miraculouſly deſtroyed all the firſt born of the Egyptians (*b*), he ſpared the firſt born of the Iſraelites, and in order to preſerve the memory of the miracle, and of that great deliverance from their bondage in Egypt, which it occaſioned, he was pleaſed to appoint that for the future all the firſt born males "ſhould be ſet apart unto himſelf (*c*)." But afterward upon the ſons of Levi diſcovering an extraordinary zeal againſt idolatry in the caſe, of the golden calf (*d*), he was pleaſed to aſſign the honour of attending his immediate ſervice to that whole tribe, inſtead of the firſt born of Iſrael (*e*). And that it might appear, there was a juſt ſubſtitution of the Levites for the firſt born

(*a*) 1 Chron. xxiii. 13, 14. (*b*) Exod. xii. 29. (*c*) Exod. xiii 12,—16, Numb. viii 17. (*d*) Exod. xxxii. 26,—28. (*e*) Numb. iii. 12, 13. chap. viii. 18.

born number for number, he ordered an estimate to be made of both; and when, on casting up the poll, the first born were found to exceed the Levites by two hundred seventy-three, the surplus was redeemed at the price of five shekels a head, which was paid to the priests for the use of the sanctuary (*a*).

The Levites, originally, were distinguished into three classes, or families, from the three sons of Levi, Kohath, Gershon, and Merari, called Kohathites, Gershonites and Merarites; though, afterwards by David, as we have already observed, they, as well as the priests, were divided into twenty-four courses (*b*). A great part of the service assigned them, on their first institution in the wilderness, was peculiar to the state of the Israelites at that time, namely, taking down the tabernacle, setting it up, and carrying it about, as they removed from place to place (*c*). To the Koathites was committed the charge of the most sacred things, the ark of the testimony, and all the instruments of the sanctuary. The Gershonites were to take down, carry and put up, the curtains of the tabernacle, and its covering of badgers skins and the veil, or curtains, which served for a door; as also the curtain, which formed the court round it. The Merarites had the care of the boards of the tabernacle, with the bars, pillars and sockets, both of the tabernacle and of the court.

When the Israelites were settled in the land of Canaan, and the tabernacle was no longer carried

(*a*) Numb. iii. 14. to the end. (*b*) 1 Chron. xxiii. 6. chap. xxviii. 11, 13.

(*c*) See the respective service of the classes in the fourth chapter of Numbers.

carried about as before, the ſervice of the Levites was, of courſe, changed, and became much eaſier. On which account, in David's time, they were thought fit to enter on their office at twenty years old (*a*); whereas they were not admitted, by the original appointment of Moſes, till they were twenty-five or thirty, and were diſcharged at fifty (*b*); probably, becauſe their ſervice was then very laborious, and required great bodily ſtrength. I ſay, they were not to enter on their office, till they were twenty-five or thirty years old; —the account in the fourth chapter of Numbers ſaith, they are to "do the work of the tabernacle of the congregation from thirty years old and upwards;" and in the eight chapter it is ſaid, that "from twenty-five years old and upwards they ſhould go in to wait on the ſervice of the tabernacle of the congregation." In order to reconcile theſe two accounts, ſome ſuppoſe that from twenty-five to thirty years of age, they attended only to learn the duties of their office, but did not actually perform any part of the ſervice till they were full thirty. This is the opinion of Maimonides *. But other rabbies † tell us, they entered on the eaſier and lighter parts of the ſervice, ſuch as keeping watch at the ſanctuary, and bearing a part in the choir, at twenty-five; but did not meddle with the more laborious, till thirty. The Jews indeed inform us, that the Levites paſſed through four different degrees. From one

(*a*) 1 Chron. xxiii. 24, 27, 28. (*b*) Numb. iv. 3, 23, 43. and chap. viii. 24, 25.

* De apparatu templi, cap. 3. §. vii. and alſo the Babyloniſh Gemara, Cholin. cap. 1.

† Aben Ezra on Numb. viii.

one month old to their twentieth year they were inſtructed in the law of God; from twenty to twenty-five, in the functions of their miniſtry; from thence to thirty they ſerved a ſort of apprenticeſhip, beginning to exerciſe themſelves in ſome of the lower branches of the ſacred ſervice; and laſtly, when they attained their thirtieth year, they were fully inſtituted in their office. Some have obſerved much the ſame degrees among the veſtal virgins, which perhaps were borrowed from the jewiſh Levites. Thirty years they were bound to the ſtricteſt chaſtity, the firſt ten of which were ſpent in learning the myſteries of their profeſſion; the ſecond ten they miniſtered in holy things, and the laſt ten were employed in bringing up young novices *. Some have thought, and in particular our author, that the apoſtle alludes to theſe degrees of the Levites, when he tells Timothy, that they who perform the office of a deacon well, purchaſe to themſelves a good degree, καλον βαθμον (a).

Moſes ordered, that at the age of fifty the Levites ſhould "ceaſe waiting upon the ſervice of the tabernacle, and ſhould ſerve no more (b)." Yet he immediately adds, "They ſhall miniſter with their brethren in the tabernacle of the congregation, to keep the charge, and ſhall do no ſervice." It ſeems, therefore, they were not diſmiſſed, but while they were exempted from all laborious employment, continued to execute the eaſier part of their miniſtry; and probably, inſtructed the younger Levites in the duties of their office.

We

* Dionyſ. Halicarn. lib. 2.

(a) 1 Tim. iii. 13. (b) Numb. viii. 25.

We have ſeen before, that the Levites were originally divided into three families. In David's time they were diſtinguiſhed into three claſſes, to each of which a different ſervice was aſſigned; and probably each was divided into twenty-four courſes. The firſt claſs were "to wait upon the ſons of Aaron, for the ſervice of the houſe of the Lord;" that is, to aſſiſt the prieſts in the exerciſe of their miniſtry, "to purify the holy things, to prepare the ſhew-bread, and flour, and wine, and oil for the ſacrifice; and ſometimes to kill the ſacrifice," when there was more work of that ſort then the prieſt could conveniently perform (*a*). So that it was not neceſſary, that the ſacrifice ſhould be ſlain by the prieſt, as ſome erroneouſly ſuppoſe, alledging againſt the conſideration of Chriſt's death as a proper ſacrifice, that he muſt, in that caſe, in the character of a prieſt, have ſlain himſelf.

The ſecond claſs of Levites formed the temple choir; the diviſion of this claſs into twenty-four courſes is expreſsly recorded in the twenty-fifth chapter of the firſt book of Chronicles. Some imagine, there were women ſingers, as well as men, in the temple choir; becauſe in the book of Ezra, among thoſe who returned from the babyloniſh captivity, there are ſaid to have been two hundred (*b*), and elſewhere we read of two hundred forty-five (*c*) ſinging men and women. The jewiſh doctors will, indeed, by no means admit, there were any female voices in the temple choir; and as

(*a*) 1 Chron. xxiii. 28, 29. 2 Chron. xxix. 34. and chap. xxxv. 10,—14. (*b*) Ezra ii 65. (*c*) Nehem. vii. 67.

for thoſe משררות meſhoreroth, as they are called in the Hebrew, they ſuppoſe them to be the wives of thoſe who ſung *. Nevertheleſs the following paſſage makes it evident, that women, likewiſe, were thus employed, "God gave to Heman fourteen ſons, and three daughters; and all theſe were under the hands of their father for ſong in the houſe of the Lord, with cymbals, pſalteries, and harps, for the ſervice of the houſe of God (*a*)."

Inſtrumental muſick was firſt introduced into the jewiſh ſervice by Moſes, and afterward, by the expreſs command of God, was very much improved with the addition of ſeveral inſtruments in the reign of David. When Hezekiah reſtored the temple ſervice, which had been neglected in his predeceſſor's reign, it is ſaid, that "he ſet the Levites in the houſe of the Lord, with cymbals, with pſalteries, and with harps, according to the commandment of David, and of Gad the king's ſeer, and Nathan the prophet; for ſo was the commandment of the Lord by his prophets (*b*)." The inſtruments originally appointed in the law of Moſes, were only two; namely, the חצוצרת chatſotſeroth, or ſilver trumpets (*c*), which they "were to blow in their ſolemn days, and over their burnt offerings, and over the ſacrifices of their peace offerings (*d*);" and the שופר ſhophar, or cornet, as the word is rendered in the following paſſage of the Pſalmiſt, "With trumpets and ſound of cornet make a joyful noiſe before the Lord, the king (*e*)." Here it is expreſsly diſtinguiſhed from the trumpet, though

* Reland. Antiq. part. ii. cap. vi. §. vi. p. 235. edit. 3. 1717.

(*a*) 1 Chron. xxv. 5, 6. (*b*) 2 Chron. xxix. 25.
(*c*) Numb. x. 2. (*d*) ver. 10. (*e*) Pſal. xcviii. 6.

though in many other places, in our verſion, it is confounded with it. As we are informed, that the שופרות ſhopheroth, uſed at the ſiege of Jericho, were of "rams horns (*a*)," it is probable this inſtrument was made of horn, and is therefore properly rendered, a cornet. It was appointed by the law to be blown throughout the land, when they proclaimed the year of Jubilee, on the day of atonement (*b*). It may be obſerved, that as no other inſtruments are preſcribed by the ritual beſides the trumpet and the cornet, it is likely they were the only ones at that time in uſe among the Jews, and which they had ſkill to play on; except we reckon the תוף toph, or timbrel, which was uſed by the women (*c*). But as that was properly a ſort of tabor, without any variety of notes, uſed only to accompany the voice, it hardly deſerves to be ranked among the muſical inſtruments. It is not, indeed, likely, the Iſraelites, who were a poor labouring people, but lately come from working at the brick kilns, ſhould have much ſkill in muſick at the time of their receiving the law. Only ſome could make ſhift to ſound the horn, or the trumpet; which therefore was all the muſick that could then be preſcribed to attend the ſacrifices. But when they were grown more polite and ſkilful, in the reign of David, ſeveral other inſtruments were added by divine direction. When ſome, therefore, plead for inſtrumental muſick in chriſtian worſhip, as pleaſing to God, though not commanded, from the notion of its having been firſt introduced

(*a*) Joſh. vi. 4. (*b*) Lev. xxv. 9. (*c*) Exod. xv. 20.

duced into the jewiſh worſhip by David without any divine inſtitution; notwithſtanding which God approved of it; they commit two miſtakes. For David did not introduce any part of the temple muſick without an expreſs divine injunction: "So was the commandment of the Lord by his prophets." And it was not firſt brought in by him, but by Moſes; who preſcribed it to attend the ſacrifices, ſo far as it could be practiſed in thoſe times. And when, in after ages, they were more ſkilful in muſick, and capable of performing the ſervice in a better manner, they were required ſo to do; nevertheleſs not one new inſtrument was then added without divine direction and appointment. But to return to the temple choir.

The muſick there uſed, was both vocal and inſtrumental: "As well ſingers, as players on inſtruments, ſhall be there (*a*)." In David's time there were appointed three maſters of the band of muſick, Heman, Aſaph and Ethan (*b*); whoſe names are prefixed to ſome of the Pſalms, perhaps, becauſe they ſet them to muſick. Aſaph's name is inſcribed to the fiftieth, ſeventy third, and ten following Pſalms; Heman's to the eighty eighth, and Ethan's to the eighty ninth. There was alſo, over all the reſt, one chief muſician, or head maſter of the choir, to whom ſeveral of the Pſalms are inſcribed, or to whoſe care it was intruſted, to have them ſet to muſick, and performed in the tabernacle, or temple. At the time of writing the thirty ninth, ſixty ſecond, and ſeventy ſeventh Pſalms, this maſter's name was Jeduthun.

The

(*a*) Pſal. lxxxvii. 7. (*b*) 1 Chron. xv. 17.

The vocal muſick was performed by the Levites. The hebrew doctors ſay, the number of voices muſt not be leſs than twelve, but might be more without limitation *. They add, that the youth, the ſons of the Levites, bore a part with their fathers in the choir; which they ground on this paſſage in the book of Ezra †, "Then ſtood Joſhua with his ſons, Kadmiel and his ſons, and ſung together by courſe, in praiſing and giving thanks unto the Lord (*a*)."

As for inſtrumental muſick, though it was performed chiefly by the Levites, yet the rabbies ſay, other Iſraelites who were ſkilful, if they were men of worth and piety, might bear a part ‡: This they ground on the account we have, that on occaſion of David's fetching the ark from "Kirjath-jearim, he and all the houſe of Iſrael played before the Lord on all manner of inſtruments (*b*)."

In the temple choir there were both wind and ſtringed inſtruments; the chief of the former was the חצוצרה chatſotſerah, which we have ſpoken of before. The name of it is ſuppoſed to have an affinity with, and to be formed from its ſound. We find that this muſick attended at the ſervice of the altar. Thus when Solomon and all the people offered ſacrifices at the dedication of the temple, "the Levites played on inſtruments of muſick, and the prieſts ſounded trumpets before them (*c*)." And when Hezekiah purified the houſe of the Lord and reſtored the temple ſervice, and on that occaſion offered ſacrifices, "the Levites

* Gnerachin in Miſhn. cap. 2. §. 6. Maimon. & Bartenor. in loc. & Gemara, fol. 11. 6. Maimon. de appar. templi, cap. iii. §. iii. † Gloſſa, ibid. ‡ Maimon. de apparatu templi, ubi ſupra. (*a*) Ezra iii. 9,—11. (*b*) 2 Sam. vi. 5. (*c*) 2 Chron. vii. 6.

ſtood with the inſtruments of David, and the prieſts with the trumpets (*a*)." In both theſe paſſages the prieſts are ſaid to ſound the trumpets, and not the Levites, who played on other inſtruments. And thus when David brought up the ark out of the houſe of Obed-edom, the Levites were appointed to be ſingers with inſtruments of muſick, pſalteries, harps and cymbals, and the prieſts did blow with the trumpets (*b*)," as it was preſcribed in the law of Moſes, "The ſon of Aaron the prieſt ſhall blow with the trumpets (*c*)."

According to the hebrew doctors, there muſt be two trumpets at leaſt (*d*), and not more than a hundred and twenty *, becauſe that was the number uſed when the ark was brought into Solomon's temple (*e*). They ſay, that in ſinging the Pſalms the voices and inſtruments made three intermiſſions, or pauſes, which they call פרקים perakim, from פרק parak, rupit; and that then the prieſts ſounded the trumpets. So that Dr. Lightfoot ſays, the trumpets were never joined with the choir in concert, but ſounded only when the choir was ſilent †. However, in this he is undoubtedly miſtaken; for on the occaſion above referred to, of bringing the ark into the temple, we find the trumpets and voices and cymbals and other inſtruments of muſick united in one grand chorus: "The trumpeters and ſingers were as one, to make one ſound in praiſing the Lord; and they lift up their voices with the trumpets and cymbals and

(*a*) 2 Chron. xxix. 26. and ſo likewiſe in many other places. (*b*) 1 Chron. xv. 16, 24. (*c*) Numb. x. 8. (*d*) Numb. x. 2. * Maimon. de apparatu templi, cap. iii. §. iv. Crenii Faſcic. ſexti, p. 103. Miſhn. in Gnerachin, cap. 2. §. 5. & De Bartenor. in loc. & Maimon. in §. 6. p. 197, 198. tom. 5. edit. Surenhus.
(*e*) 2 Chron. v. 12. † Temple ſervice, chap. 7. §. 2.

and inſtruments of muſick, and praiſed the Lord (*a*).

Another wind inſtrument, in uſe among the Jews, was the חלִיל chalil, the pipe, flute, or hautboy. The rabbies ſay, it was uſed only on twelve days in the year *; but it does not appear in ſcripture, that it was ever uſed in the temple ſervice. It is ſaid, indeed, in Iſaiah, "Ye ſhall have gladneſs of heart, as when one goeth with a pipe to come into the mount of the Lord, to the mighty one of Iſrael (*b*)." But that may probably allude to the people's having muſick playing before them, when they came in companies from all parts of the countries, to pay their worſhip at the national alter on the three grand feſtivals. The חלִיל chalil, might be a common inſtrument, uſed on that occaſion, though not in the temple choir.

The other muſical inſtruments, chiefly uſed in the ſacred ſervice, were the נבלים nebhalim, כנרות kinnoroth, and the מצלתים metſiltaim, which in the fifteenth chapter of the firſt book of Chronicles we render pſalteries, harps and cymbals (*c*). The נבל nebhel, and the כנר kinnor, the pſaltery and harp, are both ſaid to be ſtringed inſtruments. Joſephus deſcribes the kinnor as having ten χορδαι, or ſtrings, (which, as the word ſignifies, were all open notes in the manner of our harps or harpſicords); and the nebhel as having twelve φθογγοι, notes or ſounds; produced by ſtopping with frets in the manner of our viols; for ſo Dr. Lightfoot imagines theſe two words ſhould

(*a*) 2 Chron. v. 13.
(*b*) Iſai. xxx. 29.
* Maimon. ubi ſupra §. vi. Miſhn. in Gnerachin, cap. 2. §. 3. p. 196. tom. 5.
(*c*) 1 Chron. xv. 16.

ſhould be explained. Joſephus further ſaith, that the kinnor was ſtruck πληκτρῳ, with a quill, as we play on the dulcimer; and the nebhel, twanged with the fingers, as we play on the lute *. But if they had got into the way, by ſtopping, of playing ſeveral notes on one ſtring, in Joſephus's time, I much ſuſpect they had not that contrivance in David's; becauſe he ſeems to ſpeak of an inſtrument of ten ſtrings as the grandeſt, and moſt excellent of all, on account of the number of its ſtrings (a). Whereas if they had had the way of ſtopping them, as we do the violin, I can ſee no ſufficient reaſon, why ſuch a number of ſtrings ſhould be reckoned a mark of excellence, when fewer would have reached as large a compaſs as they had ever occaſion for. It ſeems, therefore, as if ten open ſtrings, or ten notes, was the whole compaſs of their muſick in thoſe days. And to this time the eaſtern muſick hath but a ſmall compaſs of notes.

The צלצל tſeltſel, which both the ſeptuagint (b) and Joſephus † tranſlate κυμβαλον the cymbal, ſeems to have been neither a wind nor ſtringed inſtrument, but ſomething made of metal, which gave a ſound with ſtriking upon it, without any variety of notes, like a bell. Joſephus gives no other deſcription of Cymbals, but that they were great and broad and made of braſs. Mr. Lampe has written a treatiſe de Cymbalis veterum. And Sir Richard Ellis, who hath one on the ſame ſubject in his Fortuita

* Joſeph. Antiq. lib. vii. cap. xii. §. 8. edit. Haverc. and Lightfoot's temple ſervice, ubi ſupra.

(a) Pſal. xxxiii. 2. xcii. 3. cxliv. 9. (b) In 1 Chron. xv. 16.

† Ubi ſupra.

Fortuita ſacra, ſhows the ancient cymbals were generally two braſs hemiſpheres, or baſons, which the muſicians ſtruck againſt one another with great addreſs, in time to the ſong, or other muſick which they accompanied. This is the inſtrument, to which the apoſtle alludes when he compareth a profeſſor of religion without charity or love, to "the ſounding braſs or tinkling cymbal (*a*)." The hebrew name צלצל tſeltſel, is probably taken from its repeated, uniform ſound; and ſo may the greek word αλαλαζον, which we tranſlate by a like, namely, tinkling. Perhaps our kettle drums may be ſuppoſed to ſucceed the cymbals of the ancients, though if the rabbies ſay right, there was but one cymbal in the temple concert *, and it could not, therefore, anſwer the ſame end our kettle drums do; which are always placed in pairs, and being tuned at a fourth to each other, make an agreeable baſs to the trumpet.

There are ſome other inſtruments of which we have no remaining deſcription, mentioned in the hundreth and fiftieth Pſalm, as uſed in praiſing God, but whether in the temple ſervice, does not appear. The uſe of inſtrumental muſick in publick worſhip was one of the typical ceremonies of the jewiſh religion, which is abrogated, therefore, with the reſt by the goſpel diſpenſation, and there is no revival of this inſtitution in the New Teſtament. The ancient fathers were ſo far from practiſing or approving inſtrumental muſick in chriſtian worſhip, that ſome of them would hardly allow it was uſed in the jewiſh; but put allegorical interpretations on the texts that mention it. The unknown

(*a*) 1 Cor. xiii. 1.

* Miſhn. ubi ſupra, §. 5. Maimon. ubi ſupra, §. iv.

unknown author of the commentary on the Pſalms, in St. Jerom's works, makes the inſtrument of ten ſtrings to ſignify the ten commandments (*a*). And he hath this notable obſervation on the following paſſage, "Praiſe him with ſtringed inſtruments and organs (*b*)," that the guts being twiſted by reaſon of abſtinence from food, and ſo all carnal deſires ſubdued, men are found fit for the kingdom of God to ſing his praiſe. St. Baſil calls muſical inſtruments, the invention of Jubal of the race of Cain *. And Clement of Alexandria ſays, they are better for beaſts than men †. That muſical inſtruments were not uſed even in the popiſh church in Thomas Aquinas's time, about the year 1250, appears from this paſſage in his queſtions ‡, "In the old law God was praiſed both with muſical inſtruments, and human voices; but the chriſtian church does not uſe inſtruments to praiſe him, leſt ſhe ſhould ſeem to judaize." So that it ſeems, inſtrumental muſick hath been introduced into chriſtian worſhip, within about the laſt 500 years, in the darkeſt and moſt corrupt times of popery. It is retained in the lutheran church, contrary to the opinion of Luther; who, as Eckard confeſſes, reckoned organs among the enſigns of Baal. Organs are ſtill uſed in ſome of the dutch churches, but againſt the minds of their paſtors; for in the national ſynod at Middleburgh, anno 1581, and in that of Holland and

(*a*) In Pſal. xxxiii. 2. and xliii. 4, &c. (*b*) Pſal. cl. 4.

* Comment. in Iſaiah, cap. 5. apud Op. tom. 1. p. 56, edit. Paris 1618.

† Pædag. lib. ii. cap. 4. init.

‡ Secunda ſecundæ Quæſtio 91. art. 4. Concluſ. 4.

and Zealand, anno 1594, it was reſolved that they would endeavour to obtain of the magiſtrates, the laying aſide of organs, and the ſinging with them in churches *. The church of England alſo, in her homilies, ſtrongly remonſtrates againſt the uſe of organs, and other inſtruments of muſick in churches. In the homily on the place and time of prayer, after mention of piping, ſinging, chaunting, and playing on organs, which was in uſe before the reformation, we are exhorted "greatly to rejoice, and give thanks to God that our churches are delivered out of theſe things, that diſpleaſed God ſo ſore, and ſo filthily defiled the holy houſe and place of prayer." I only add, that the voice of harpers and muſicians, and of pipers and trumpeters, is mentioned among the glories of the myſtical Babylon, "that mother of harlots and abominations of the earth, whom God will deſtroy with the ſword of his mouth, and with the brightneſs of his coming (*a*)." But to return to the Levites:—

The third claſs were the porters, to whoſe charge the ſeveral gates of the courts of the ſanctuary were appointed by lot (*b*). "They waited at every gate; and were not permitted to depart from their ſervice (*c*);" and they attended by turns in their courſes, as the other Levites did (*d*).

Their proper buſineſs was to open and ſhut the gates, and to attend at them by day, as a ſort of peace officers, in order to prevent any tumult among the people; to keep ſtrangers, and

* Vid. Apolog. (Hicmanni) pro Miniſtris in Anglâ nonconformiſtis, p. 139.

(*a*) Rev. xviii. 22. (*b*) 1 Chron. xxvi. 1, 13, 19.
(*c*) 2 Chron. xxxv. 15. (*d*) See 2 Chron. viii. 14.

and the excommunicated and unclean persons, from entering into the holy court; and in short, to prevent whatever might be prejudicial to the safety, peace and purity of the holy place and service.

The rabbies assign several particular works to these porters, as brushing the gate, cleaning the gilding, &c. which probably belonged to their office, as they had the charge of the sacred buildings; but of which there is no occasion to speak distinctly.

They also kept guard by night about the temple and its courts; and they are said to have been twenty-four *, including three priests, who stood centry at so many different places. There was a superior officer over the whole guard, called by Maimonides † "the man of the mountain of the house;" he walked the round as often as he pleased; when he passed a centinel that was standing, he said, "Peace be unto you." But if he found one asleep, he struck him; and he had liberty to set fire to his garment. This custom may, perhaps, be alluded to in the following passage, "Behold I come as a thief, that is, unawares; blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments (*a*)." The hundred and thirty-fourth Psalm seems to be addressed to these watchmen of the temple, "who by night stand in the house of the Lord;" in which they are exhorted to employ their waking hours in acts of praise and devotion. "Thus the Levites, as it is said in the first book of Chronicles, were employed in the work day and night (*b*)." Godwin observes, "that

* Maimon. de ædificio templi, cap. viii. §. iv. Crenii Fascicul. sexti, p. 70. † Ibid. §. x. p. 71, 72.

(*a*) Rev. xvi. 15. (*b*) 1 Chron. ix. 33.

"that ſome of the Levites had the charge of the treaſures of the temple." It is ſaid, that "of the Levites Ahijah was over the treaſures of the houſe of God, and over the treaſures of the dedicated things (*a*)." But I do not conceive, it was a diſtinct claſs of Levites, that was entruſted with the treaſures, and dedicate things; but rather, that herein they acted as aſſiſtants to the prieſts or as inferior officers under them; it appearing that the high-prieſt, and others of the chief of the prieſts, had the charge of thoſe things as well as the porters, who might probably have the immediate care of them under their ſuperior direction. "The king commanded Hilkiah the high-prieſt, and the prieſt of the ſecond order, and the keepers of the doors, to bring forth out of the temple of the Lord all the veſſels that were made for Baal, &c (*b*)." Godwin adds, that "others of the Levites were overſeers and judges," שֹׁטְרִים ſhoterim, and שֹׁפְטִים ſhophetim, as they are called in the firſt book of Chronicles (*c*); where ſix thouſand Levites are ſaid to have been appointed to theſe offices in David's time. For though God had ordered in the law of Moſes, that they ſhould appoint שֹׁפְטִים ſhophetim, and שֹׁטְרִים ſhoterim, in all their gates (*d*); yet it ſhould ſeem, that order and appointment had been much neglected; the heads of the tribes, perhaps, having taken upon them to judge and determine controverſies in their reſpective tribes, only in cauſes of great moment allowing an appeal to the king; for that David uſed, himſelf, to act as judge, and determine controverſies

(*a*) 1 Chron. xxvi. 20. (*b*) 2 Kings xxiii. 4.
(*c*) chap. xxiii. 4. (*d*) Deut. xvi. 18.

troverſies betwixt his ſubjects may be concluded from the following paſſage, "When any man that had a controverſy came to the king for judgment, then Abſalom called unto him, and ſaid, Of what city art thou? &c (*a*)." But when David was introducing his ſon Solomon to the throne, he was deſirous of ſettling the inferior courts according to the original inſtitution; well knowing that was the likelieſt way of preſerving the peace, and conſulting the welfare of the nation. Accordingly he reſtored theſe judicatories to their ancient order, and conſtituted Levites to be officers and judges.

We have had an occaſion already to ſpeak of the diſtinction betwixt the שפטים ſhophetim, and שטרים ſhoterim; and we then obſerved, that the שפטים ſhophetim, were the ſuperior magiſtrates or judges, as may be concluded from that title's being applied to the chief magiſtrate under God, or the temporary viceroy, for ſeveral ages. As for the שטרים ſhoterim, they ſeem to have been the inferior officers in the judicatory courts, who attended the ſuperior, and are therefore continually mentioned along with them; who, by whatever title they are diſtinguiſhed, whether judges, rulers, elders, or captains, ſtill had their שטרים ſhoterim (*b*). But in this account of David's appointment of the Levites to their offices (*c*), the שטרים ſhoterim, are placed before the שפטים ſhophetim (*d*). From hence Dr. Patrick conjectures, we are not to take them for inferior perſons, but for men of great authority, whom the

(*a*) 2 Sam. xv. 2. (*b*) Deut. i. 15. chap. xvi. 18. Joſh. viii. 33. 2 Chron. xix. 11. Prov. vi. 7.
(*c*) 1 Chron. xxiii. 4. quoted above. (*d*) So likewiſe in Joſh. viii 33.

the targum calls governors; who, like our juſtices of the peace, ſaw good order kept and the laws obſerved, while the province of the judges was the deciding cauſes in their ſeveral courts.

Some think their judicial authority extended no further than their own tribe, and the judging and determining controverſies which aroſe among the inferior prieſts and Levites, eſpecially about matters relating to the ſacred miniſtry. But this opinion is hardly conſiſtent with the account we have, that "Jehoſaphat ſet of the Levites, and of the prieſts, along with the chief of the fathers of Iſrael, for the judgment of the Lord and for controverſies (*a*);" that is, all ſorts of cauſes, both eccleſiaſtical and civil. And the Levites were the שטרים ſhoterim, officers "under Amaziah, who was chief in all matters of the Lord;" and "under Zebadiah, the ruler of the houſe of Judah for all the king's matters (*b*)."

Upon the whole it ſhould ſeem, the magiſtracy belonged not to the Levites, or any claſs of them, meerly as Levites; but only as they generally addicted themſelves more to the ſtudy of the law, and had more leiſure to attend on the duties of the magiſtracy, than other perſons who were employed in ſecular buſineſs.

The magiſtrates of different ranks, both the שפטים ſhophetim, and שטרים ſhoterim *, were very generally, though not always, choſen out of that tribe. And thus the prophetick curſe, which Jacob pronounced upon Levi, that his poſterity ſhould be ſcattered amongſt the tribes of Iſrael (*c*), was remarkably accompliſhed, (though in effect converted into a bleſſing,) not

(*a*) 2 Chron. xix. 8. (*b*) ver. 11.

* See above, p. 34,—37. (*c*) Gen. xlix. 7

only in respect to the appointment of their habitation, (of which we shall take notice hereafter,) but likewise of their offices and employments; more of them, than perhaps of all the other tribes together, being officers and judges throughout the whole country; and probably, as the rabbies tell us, some of them were, generally, directors of their seminaries of learning *.

Godwin observes, that the consecration of the Levites, in Moses's time, began at the twenty fifth year of their age; in David's, at the twentieth; and "here, saith he, we may note the liberty granted to the church in changing ceremonies." But he would undoubtedly have spared this note, if he had attended to what David declares, namely, that "he had appointed the courses of the priests, and the Levites," (which included the time of their entering on their ministry) "and all the service of the house of the Lord," by the express order of God himself. "All this, says David, the Lord made me understand in a writing by his hand upon me (a)." It does not therefore, appear from hence, that there was any such liberty given to the church under the Old Testament, as our author mentions; but rather the contrary; and I apprehend, it will be hard to find it any where, either in the Old Testament, or in the New.

As for the consecration of the Levites, when they were offered by the priest, it is said, "Aaron shall offer them before the Lord for an

* See the authorities in Vitringa de synag. vetera, lib. 3. part. 2. cap. 8. p. 364, 365. who however looks upon this to be a rabbinical fiction. Dr. Lightfoot supposes the 48 cities of the Levites to have been a kind of universities. See his Harmony on Matt. ii. 4.

(a) 1 Chron. xxviii. 13, 19.

an offering of the children of Iſrael (a)." But the literal tranſlation is, "Aaron ſhall wave them for a wavering, or wave offering, before Jehovah." The targum renders it, "Elevabit Aaron Levitas elevatione coram Domino." This is a manifeſt alluſion to an ancient ſacrifical rite, namely, waving the ſacrifices before the Lord. This waving was of two kinds; one called תרומה terumah, from רום rum, elevatus eſt; which, they ſay, was performed by waving it perpendicularly, upward and downward; the other תנופה tenuphah, from נוף nuph, agitare, movere; which the jewiſh writers tell us, was performed by waving it horizontally, towards the four cardinal points, to denote the conſecration of what was thus waved, to the Lord of the whole earth *. And this word is applied to the conſecration of the Levites in the paſſage before quoted. The ſeptuagint renders it by ἀφορίζω: and as this word is uſed, in the hiſtory of the acts, for the ſeparation, or conſecration, of Paul and Barnabas to the miniſtry of the goſpel among the Gentiles (b), Godwin conceives, it is in alluſion to the conſecration and ſeparation of the jewiſh Levites to the miniſtry of the tabernacle. The ſame greek word occurs concerning Paul in the epiſtle to the Romans, where he ſaith of himſelf, that he was ἀφωρισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον, ſet apart for the goſpel (c). However, he may here allude, perhaps to his having been a Phariſee, or פרוש pharoſh, which coming from פרש pharaſh, ſeparavit, ſignifies ἀφωρισμένος: and as before his converſion he gloried in

(a) Numb. viii. 11.

* Abarbanel, Bechai, and Levi Ben Gerſon, quoted by Outram, de Sacrificiis, p. 162.

(b) Acts xiii. 2. (c) Rom. i. 1.

in being a phariſee, αφωρισμενος εις νομον, ſo he now does in being αφωρισμενος εις ευαγγελιον.

Another ceremony, at the conſecration of the Levites, was impoſition of hands: "Thou ſhalt bring the Levites before the Lord, and the children of Iſrael ſhall put their hands upon them (a)." By the בני ישראל bene Iſrael, children of Iſrael, ſome jewiſh doctors underſtand the firſt born*, in whoſe room the Levites were ſubſtituted (b). And their laying their hands, every one, on the head of his ſubſtitute, had the ſame ſignification, as the Levites laying their hands on the head of the bullocks that were to be ſacrificed for them (c), or to ſuffer and die in their room and ſtead; that is, denoting, not only their conſecration to God, but their ſubſtitution to attend the ſervice of God at his tabernacle, inſtead of the firſt born.

Or if by the בני ישראל bene Iſrael, we underſtand with Dr. Patrick, the elders, as repreſentatives of the whole aſſembly mentioned in the words preceding, we may ſuppoſe their laying their hands on the Levites was a form of benediction; as when Jacob laid his hand on Ephraim and Manaſſeh, and ſaid, "God, before whom my fathers walked, bleſs the lads (d)." And as when little children were brought to our Saviour, that he might bleſs them, he laid his hands upon them (e).

This ceremony, uſed at the conſecration of the Levites, came afterward into uſe at the conſecration of other perſons into either civil or ſacred offices. Joſhua was conſecrated captain general of the tribes of Iſrael by impoſition of

(a) Numb. viii. 10. * Vid. Ainſworth in loc.
(b) ver. 17, 18. (c) ver. 12. (d) Gen. xlviii. 15, 16. (e) Matt. xix. 15.

of the hands of Moſes (*a*). And the ſame rite continued in the chriſtian church at the ordination of officers both ordinary and extraordinary; particularly, of the ſeven deacons (*b*); of Barnabas and Saul to a ſpecial ſervice, to which God called them (*c*); and of ordinary paſtors (*d*).

There is a difference, which Godwin obſerves, between χειροθεσια and χειροτονια, the former ſignifying the conſecration of a perſon to an office by the impoſition of hands; the latter, his election or choice by holding up of hands. It is derived from an ancient cuſtom of the Athenians in the choice of their magiſtrates; among whom the candidates being propoſed to the people, who ſignified their choice by holding up their hands, he, who had moſt, was looked upon as duly elected *. Thus there was a brother χειροτονηθεις απο των εκκλησιων, appointed by the ſuffrage of the churches to travel along with Paul, to convey their alms to the poor ſaints in Judea (*e*). And in the hiſtory of the Acts we are informed, that Paul and Barnabas having travelled to Derbe, Lyſtra, Iconium and Antioch, had been there employed in appointing by ſuffrage elders in every city, χειροτονησαντες αυτοις πρεσβυτερους κατ' εκκλησιαν (*f*): a form of expreſſion, which intimates, that they referred it to the people to chooſe their

(*a*) Numb. xxvii. 18. (*b*) Acts vi. 6. (*c*) Acts xiii. 2, 3. (*d*) 1 Tim. iv. 14. eſpecially, chap. v. 22.

* Ariſtophan. in Εκκλησ. p. 371. Vid. Suiceri Theſaur. in verb. χειροτονια, who quotes Demoſthenes and Æſchines, to ſhow that this attick cuſtom was expreſſed by the word χειροτονια. Vid. etiam Conſtantini Lexicon in verb. χειροτονεω, & χειροτονια.

(*e*) 2 Cor. viii. 19. (*f*) Acts xiv. 23.

their own presbyters or pastors, in whose ordination they assisted *.

Before we dismiss the consideration of the Levites, it will be proper to take notice of the place of their ordinary residence, and of their subsistence.

As to their residence, they, as well as the priests, were precluded, by the law, from sharing the promised inheritance of Canaan with their brethren of the other tribes (*a*): "The priests, the Levites, and all the tribe of Levi, shall have no part nor inheritance with Israel; they shall have no inheritance among their brethren." The meaning is, they were to have no tract of land separately allotted to them as a tribe, in the same manner as the other tribes had; but in lieu of that, they had forty-eight cities with their suburbs, assigned them out of the other tribes, thirteen of which belonged to the priests, and thirty-five to the rest of the tribe of Levi (*b*). It may be observed, that the cities of the priests were, for the most part, in the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, and consequently nearer to Jerusalem, which stood in the confines of these two tribes; whereas those of the Levites were divided to them by lot out of the other tribes on either side Jordan. And thus God converted Jacob's curse on Levi, which we spoke of before, into a national blessing, by dispersing the priests and Levites, whose office it was to preserve and teach knowledge, throughout the whole land. Dr. Lightfoot makes these forty-eight cities to be so many

* Vid. Witsii Meletem. de vitâ Pauli, sect. iii. paragr. xx. p. 53,—55.

(*a*) Deut. xviii. 1, 2. (*b*) Numb. xxxv. 1,—8. Josh. xxi.

many universities, where the ministerial Tribe studied the law, and diffused the knowledge of it through the nation *. Of these six were appointed cities of refuge, for protecting of persons from the rigour of the law in case of involuntary homicide, of which we shall discourse in its proper place. The levitical cities had suburbs and fields surrounding them, to the extent of three thousand cubits on every side: "The suburbs of the cities, which ye shall give unto the Levites shall reach from the wall of the city and outward a thousand cubits round about; and ye shall measure from without the city on the east side two thousand cubits, on the south side two thousand cubits, on the west side two thousand cubits, on the north side two thousand cubits; and the city shall be in the midst. This shall be to them the suburbs of the cities (a)." To reconcile the seeming contradiction between the thousand and two thousand cubits, Junius supposes the latter number expresses the diameter of the suburbs, the city being abstracted, from out to out. So that the whole territory, belonging to the city, reached no farther than a thousand cubits †. But Dr. Lightfoot follows the more probable opinion of Maimonides ‡; namely, that the former thousand cubits were for suburbs, more properly so called; for outhouses, barns, stables, &c. and, it may be, for gardens of herbs and

* See his chorographical century of the land of Israel, chap. 97.

(a) Numb. xxxv. 4, 5.

† Junius in loc.

‡ Lightfoot, ubi supra, ab init. Vid. etiam Mishn. Sotah, cap. v. §. 3. Maimon. & Bartenora in loc. tom. 3. p. 248. edit. Surenhus.

flowers; and the latter two thouſand were for fields and vineyards *, which are called the "fields of the ſuburbs (a)." From the produce of theſe fields and vineyards aroſe ſome part of the ſubſiſtence of the prieſts and Levites, when they were not in waiting at the ſanctuary; for in the weeks of their attendance they were maintained by the dues ariſing from the ſacrifices. As the apoſtle obſerves, "Do ye not know that they who miniſter about holy things, live of the things of the temple; and they who wait at the altar, are partakers of the altar (b)." Beſide theſe dues, the firſt fruits, which were brought to the temple, and the money paid for the redemption of the firſt born, contributed towards their ſubſiſtence. But when they were out of waiting, their maintenance partly, as we have ſaid, aroſe from the glebes belonging to their cities; but chiefly, from the tythes of the produce of the whole country, which the law allotted to the tribe of Levi: "Behold, ſaith God, I have given the children of Levi all the tenth in Iſrael for an inheritance, for their ſervice which they ſerve (c)." This tythe the people paid both from the animal and vegetable produce of their

* Mr. Lowman underſtands the thouſand cubits to be the meaſurement of the ſuburbs every way from the walls of the city into the country; and the two thouſand cubits, the meaſurement from the beginning of the ſuburbs on the country ſide into the centre of the city. See his civil government of the Hebrews, p. 110. It is remarkable that the ſeptuagint reads two thouſand in both places. And both Joſephus and Philo mention only two thouſand. Joſeph. Antiq. lib. iv. cap. iv. §. 3. tom. 1. p. 204. edit. Havere. & Philo de ſacerdotum honoribus, ſub finem, p. 645. edit. Colon. Allobr. 1613.

(a) Lev. xxv. 34. (b) 1 Cor. ix. 13. (c) Numb. xviii. 21.

their eſtates; from the ſeed of the lands, and the fruit of the trees; from the ſheep and black cattle (*a*). It was paid immediately to the Levites, who probably received it, either on the ſpot where it was produced; or, at leaſt, in their ſeveral cities (*b*). Out of this tythe the Levites paid a tenth part to the prieſts (*c*), which is called their תרומה terumah, or heave offering, as we render it, to the Lord; in like manner as the general tythe, paid by the people, is called their תרומה terumah (*d*). Not that we are to ſuppoſe all their tythes were lifted up towards heaven, as were ſome of the oblations, in token of their deſire that God might accept them; but becauſe they were ſo far of the ſame nature with the things offered to God by that rite, as to be ſeparated and ſet apart for his uſe and ſervice. In which ſenſe all the offerings, or free donations to God required for building him a ſanctuary, are called תרומה terumah (*e*); which the Chaldee paraphraſe tranſlates, "That which is ſupported."

Beſides this tythe, which the people were to pay to the Levites, they were alſo to tythe the remaining nine parts, and of that tythe to make a feaſt, to be kept in the court of the ſanctuary, or in ſome apartment belonging to it; or in caſe they lived ſo remote, that they could not with convenience carry this tythe thither in kind, they might ſell it, and purchaſe proviſions with the money, when they came to the ſanctuary; only adding a fifth part thereto (*f*). At this feaſt, which was kept in token of

(*a*) Lev. xxvii. 30. 2 Chron. xxxi. 5, 6. (*b*) Nehem. x. 37. (*c*) Numb. xviii 25,—28. (*d*) ver. 24. (*e*) Exod. xxv. 2. (*f*) Deut. xii. 17, 18. chap. xiv. 22,—27. Lev. xxvii. 31.

of their thankfulneſs to God, for his providential bounties, they were to entertain not only their own families and friends, but alſo the Levites. It is not expreſsly ſaid, how many of them were to be invited; that was left to prudence, and to be determined by the quantity of proviſions; only in general the law is, "Thoſe ſhall eat there before the Lord thy God, and thou ſhalt rejoice, thou and thy houſhold, and the Levite, that is within thy gate; thou ſhalt not forſake him." Now that this tythe was different from that paid to the Levites, is manifeſt, firſt, in that the tythe paid to them was for their own uſe; whereas this was conſumed by the owners and their friends; only they were to invite ſome Levites to the feaſt. Secondly, That tythe was paid all the country over, this only at the ſanctuary. Thirdly, The Levites were to pay a tenth of their tythe to the prieſts, which they could not do of this, having no property in it, except that they were to partake of it as invited gueſts.

Beſides theſe two tythes, Joſephus *, and the apocryphal book, Tobit (a), ſpeak of a third, paid once in three years; which was given away in charity. And ſome jewiſh writers, therefore, call it the poor man's tythe †. This opinion may ſeem to receive ſome countenance from the expreſs order in the book of Deuteronomy, that "at the end of every three years they ſhould bring forth all the tythe of their increaſe, and lay it up within their gates; that the ſtranger, the fatherleſs and the widow, as

* Antiq. lib. iv. cap. viii. §. 22. p. 238. edit. Havert.
(a) chap. i. 8.
† Maimon. de jure pauperis, cap. vi. §. 1. p. 60. edit. Prideaux, Oxon. 1679.

as well as the Levite, might come, and eat, and be ſatisfied (a). Nevertheleſs ſeveral learned Jews and Chriſtians conceive, this was not a diſtinct tythe, but the ſame with the ſecond, with only this difference, that whereas for two years together the feaſt, that was made by it, was kept at the ſanctuary, the third year it was kept by the owners at their own houſe; in order that ſuch of their poor neighbours and friends, as were aged and infirm, and could not travel to the place of the ſanctuary, might not be wholly excluded from this thankſgiving feaſt; or, as Mr. Mede expreſſes it, for two years together they paid the Levites tythe, and the feſtival tythe; but in the third year, they paid the Levites tythe, and the poor man's tythe; that is, what was wont in other years to be ſpent in feaſting, was every third year ſpent upon the poor *. But I acknowledge, that this third year's being called "the year of tything," in the twenty-ſixth chapter of Deuteronomy (b), ſeems to me to import that ſome additional tythe was paid that year.

The reaſon of God's commanding this tythe to be paid to the prieſts and Levites, was manifeſtly for their ſubſiſtence. For as they had no eſtates in land, like the other tribes, except only in their cities, and a few little fields about them; they muſt have ſtarved without ſome ſuch contribution from the other tribes. But why God would have them ſupported in this way, rather than by aſſigning them an inheritance, like the reſt of the tribes; and why this pro-

(a) Deut. xiv. 28, 29.

* See Mede's works, book 1. diſc. 33. p. 171, 172. and likewiſe Selden on tythes, chap. ii. §. iii.

(b) Deut. xxvi. 12.

proportion of a tenth was to be paid them, rather than any other, are queſtions not ſo eaſy to be reſolved.

As to the former query, why God would have the prieſts and Levites ſupported by tythes, rather than by allotting them an inheritance in land, it was no doubt, partly, that their time might not be taken up with ſecular buſineſs, and their minds burthened about worldly cares and managing their eſtates, and that they might employ themſelves wholly in the duties of their office; as Timothy is exhorted by St. Paul "to give himſelf wholly to his miniſtry;" and for that end, cautioned againſt "entangling himſelf with the affairs of this life (*a*)."

Again, God's commanding the other Iſraelites to pay tythe out of their eſtates to his prieſts and Levites might be deſigned as an acknowledgement, that they had received their eſtates from his free gift, and held them by no other tenure, but his bounty. In which view the tythes may be conſidered as a quit rent, to be annually paid to the original proprietor of the land, who had conquered it for them, and put them in poſſeſſion of it *. Paying it to the prieſts and Levites, his immediate ſervants and miniſters

(*a*) 1 Tim. iv. 15. 2 Tim. ii. 4.

* When William the Conqueror, parceled out the lands of England, he reſerved a certain ſmall rent to be annually paid out of every eſtate to the Crown as an acknowledgment, that it was received from, and held under him. This rent is paid to this day from all freehold eſtates, under the name of chief rent. Or if there be any eſtates, that pay it not, it is becauſe they have been purchaſed out of others, of which purchaſe it was made a condition that they ſhould be clear of this incumbrance, thoſe other eſtates paying it for them.

miniſters, for their maintenance and ſupport, was paying it to him; and as they held their eſtates by this tenure, a neglect or refuſal was a forfeiture. To this effect is the obſervation of rabbi Bechai * on the following words, "And thou ſhalt eat before the Lord the tythe of thy corn, of thy wine and thy oil, &c (*a*)." If, ſaith he, thou pay the tythe, then it is thy corn, &c. if not, it is mine; as it is ſaid in the prophecy of Hoſea, "Therefore will I return and take away my corn in the time thereof, and my wine in the ſeaſon thereof (*b*)." For they forfeited the whole, who did not pay a tenth, the rent which God had reſerved to himſelf.

As for the ſecond queſtion, why God appointed the proportion of a tenth rather than any other; the Jews generally ſay, it was becauſe ten is a perfect number; almoſt all nations ending their account of ſimple numbers with it, and then beginning again with compound numbers; or as others phraſe it, this is the end of leſſer numbers, and the beginning of greater; on which account it was looked upon as the moſt perfect, and therefore had in great regard. But this is too frivolous; perhaps a more ſubſtantial reaſon may be drawn from the ancient laws and cuſtoms of moſt nations, of paying a tenth to their kings. Ariſtotle mentions it as an ancient law in Babylon †; and Dr. Spencer ‡ obſerves, from a paſſage in Ariſtophanes, that it was the cuſtom

* See Patrick in loc.

(*a*) Deut. xiv. 23. (*b*) Hoſ. ii. 9.

† Ariſtot. Œconomic. lib. ii. ſub fin.

‡ De legibus hebræor. lib. iii. cap. x. §. 1. tom. 2. p. 721, 722. edit. Chappelow.

cuſtom in Athens, though a commonwealth, for the people to pay a tenth to the magiſtracy. That this was reckoned a part of the jus regum in the eaſtern countries, appears from hence, that among the other oppreſſions, which Samuel tells the Iſraelites they might expect from a king, he mentions his demanding their tythes: "He will take the tenth of your ſeed, and of your vineyards, and give to his officers, and to his ſervants (*a*)." Now, as we have ſhewn before, the prieſts and Levites, were properly the officers and miniſters of ſtate under God as king of Iſrael; and the Iſraelites paying through their hands one tenth to him, was agreeable to the cuſtom of almoſt all nations to pay one tenth to their king. Tythes then are to be conſidered as an appendage to the Theocracy, and I apprehend it will be extremely difficult to prove, that Chriſtian miniſters have a divine right to demand them, from this circumſtance of a conſtitution peculiar to the jewiſh nation. Thus much concerning the prieſts and Levites.

The rabbies ſpeak of another ſort of eccleſiaſtical perſons, termed אנשי מעמד anſhè mangnamidh, viri ſtationarii*, ſtationary men, of whom we have no mention in ſcripture. Nevertheleſs there is ſome probability in the account of the jewiſh doctors, that theſe were men choſen out of the ſeveral tribes, as repreſentatives to attend at the ſacrifices offered for all Iſrael; the law requiring that the perſons for whom ſacrifices were offered, ſhould be preſent at the offering (*b*). Among the ſacrifices offered for all Iſrael

(*a*) 1 Sam. viii. 15.

* Vid. Maimon. de apparatu templi, cap. vi. per totum, p. 126, & ſeq. Crenii Faſcic. Sexti.

(*b*) Lev. i. 3, 4. chap. iii. 2, 8.

Iſrael, or for the whole congregation, were the continual daily ſacrifices, provided at the publick charge; and extraordinary ſacrifices, when on account of the ſin of any particular perſon or perſons, any judgment of God lay upon the whole nation; as in the caſe of the Iſraelites being worſted by the Canaanites at Ai, on account of Achan's tranſgreſſion; in ſuch caſes the law directed, that "the congregation ſhould offer a young bullock for the ſin, and burn him before the tabernacle of the congregation (*a*)." On the annual faſt, or day of expiation, there was likewiſe a ſolemn ſacrifice of atonement offered for all Iſrael, "becauſe of their tranſgreſſions in all their ſins (*b*)." On ſuch occaſions, it being impoſſible that all the people ſhould be preſent, there were repreſentatives choſen, ſay the doctors, for the whole body, who being divided into twenty-four courſes attended by rotation, as the prieſts and Levites did.

The Nethinim, who come next under conſideration, were ſo called from נתן nathan, dedit, becauſe they were given to the Levites for ſervants or ſlaves, to do the drudgery belonging to the ſacred ſervice. Ezra ſays, they were given or appointed by David and the princes for the ſervice of the Levites (*c*). They were originally the Gibeonites, who obtaining a league of peace with the Iſraelites, ſoon after they came into Canaan, by artifice and fraud, were condemned by Joſhua to the loweſt and moſt laborious offices, belonging to the ſervice of the tabernacle; drawing water, fetching and cleaving wood for the fire of the altar, &c (*d*).

We

(*a*) Lev. iv. 13, 14. (*b*) Lev. xvi. 16. (*c*) Ezra viii. 20. (*d*) Joſh. ix. 3, to the end.

We never find them called Nethinim before David's time; but afterwards, when the Iſraelites had enlarged their conqueſts, and probably added others of other nations to theſe vaſſals of the ſanctuary, they were no longer called Gibeonites, but Nethinim, a name that would ſuit thoſe of one nation as well as another. From this time they do not ſeem to have been conſidered and treated like ſlaves, but rather as the loweſt order of the ſervants of the ſanctuary, having, no doubt, embraced the jewiſh religion. At their return from the captivity, they were placed in cities with the Levites (*a*). There were very few, indeed, that choſe to return, probably, becauſe of the lowneſs of their condition and ſtation amongſt the Iſraelites. We read of no more than two hundred and twenty, who came with Ezra (*b*), and three hundred ninety two with Zerubbabel (*c*). A number ſo inſufficient for the ſervice work of the temple, that Joſephus tells us, they inſtituted a feſtival, which they called ξυλοφορια, on which the people were obliged to carry a certain quantity of wood, to ſupply the altar of burnt-offerings *. The Papiſts have a ſort of officers in imitation of the Nethinim, whom they call ſubdeacons; whoſe buſineſs it is to carry a baſon of water, and a towel, to the prieſts who miniſter at the altar, to waſh their hands before they celebrate maſs.

Of

(*a*) Nehem. xi. 3. Ezra ii. 70. 1 Chron. ix. 2.
(*b*) Ezra viii. 20. (*c*) chap. ii. 58.

* Joſeph. de bell. judaic. lib. ii. cap. xvii. §. 6. p. 194. edit. Haverc.

Of the Sacrifices.

To this chapter concerning the miniſters of the ſanctuary, may properly be ſubjoined a brief account of that part of its ſervice, in which they were chiefly employed, namely, the ſacrifices.

Of their firſt inſtitution we have no certain information in ſcripture. But they were practiſed we find, in the firſt ages of the world by Cain and Abel (*a*); and by our firſt parents, probably, preſently after the fall. For we read, that "unto Adam and to his wife the Lord made coats of ſkins and cloathed them (*b*)." As animal food was not uſed till after the flood, which we formerly proved *; we cannot eaſily

(*a*) Gen. iv. (*b*) Gen. iii. 21.

* Since we conſidered this ſubject, Dr. Sykes in his late eſſay on the nature, deſign and origin of ſacrifices, in order to explain the animal ſacrifice which Abel offered, conſiſtently with his own notion of ſacrifices in general, namely, that they were a kind of eating and drinking with God as it were at his table, and in conſequence of that being in a ſtate of friendſhip with him by repentance and confeſſion of ſins (p. 120.); hath endeavoured to ſhow in oppoſition to Grotius and Le Clerc, that animals were uſed for food before the flood. And as theſe authors think the expreſs grant of animal food made after the flood, is ſufficient proof, that it was not in uſe before the flood, he enquires into the meaning of the reſpective grants to Adam and Noah (p. 167,—178.).

The former is in theſe words, (Gen. i. 29, 30.) "Behold I have given you every herb bearing ſeed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree in the which is the fruit of a tree bearing ſeed, to you it ſhall be for meat. And to every beaſt of the field, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is life, have I given every green herb for meat." And the Doctor, remarking,

imagine whence they ſo ſoon procured theſe ſkins, probably before any creature had died of themſelves, unleſs from beaſts ſlain for ſacrifice.

Whether remarking, that this grant muſt neceſſarily be underſtood with ſome limitations, ſome creatures being not formed for living upon herbs, and ſome herbs being of a poiſonous quality, infers from hence, that it was not intended to ſignify, that this or that food was prohibited, and not to be eaten by man, but to declare in general, how well God had, in his infinite wiſdom, provided for the numerous ſpecies of creatures which he had created. But I apprehend, that, if we ſhould allow there were noxious vegetables before the fall, when this grant was made, it is not a very natural inference, that becauſe it was to be limited to thoſe herbs that were ſalutary in their nature, it might for that reaſon, be extended to animal food, of which kind of food there is not the leaſt mention. It is a maxim that permiſſive laws are to be reſtrained to thoſe objects which are expreſsly declared in them, or at leaſt to thoſe which are of the ſame nature, and are evidently comprehended in the general ground and reaſon of the law.

With reſpect to the grant to Noah, "every moving thing that liveth, ſhall be meat for you, even as the green herb have I given you all things," (Gen. ix. 3.) he apprehends it does not imply any grant of animal food in general, but only of ſome particular ſorts of it, ſuch as are included in the word רֶמֶשׂ remeſh, here rendered "moving," which according to him ſignifieth, creeping things, or ſuch animals as are not comprehended under the words, beaſt and fowl. Conſequently, whatever is the meaning of this grant, it may be conſiſtent with mens eating ſheep and oxen, goats and the like animals from the firſt. But this criticiſm is without foundation, for it is certain that רֶמֶשׂ remeſh, is of very general ſignification, and uſed for all kinds of animals, or all that can move. As in the following paſſages: "All fleſh died that moveth רֹמֵשׂ haromeſh, upon the face of the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of every beaſt and creeping thing," (Gen. vii. 21.) Again, God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth, הָרֹמֶשֶׂת haromeſh, which the waters bring forth abundantly, (Gen. i. 21.); that is, all kinds of fiſhes. When therefore, God gave to Adam dominion

Whether men were led to the practiſe of ſacrificing by their own reaſon, or by the command of God, hath been a matter of controverſy both among Jews and Chriſtians. Some of the hebrew doctors are of the former opinion *, in which they are followed by Chryſoſtom; who ſaith, that Abel ſacrificed the firſt things of his flock voluntarily, and from the motion of his own conſcience, without any inſtruction, or any poſitive law †. And the author of the queſtions and anſwers to the orthodox in the works of Juſtin Martyr, aſſerts, that all, who offered animals in ſacrifice before the law of Moſes, did it without any divine command; nevertheleſs God accepted the

dominion over the fiſhes of the ſea, and over the fowls of the air, and over every living thing that moveth רומשת haremeſheth, upon the face of the earth, (ver. 28.); the רמש or רמשת remeſh or remeſheth, cannot here be underſtood to denote a particular ſpecies of animals different from fiſhes and fowls, but all ſorts of animals, or any other that can move, as well as thoſe particularly named.

The Doctor underſtands the latter clauſe, "the fleſh with the blood, which is the life thereof, thou ſhalt not eat," to be only a prohibition of eating animals, which died of themſelves, and an injunction to kill before they eat. A prohibition and injunction, which if men uſed animal food before the flood, ſeem difficult to be accounted for, unleſs upon ſuppoſition that it was their practice to feed on animals which died of themſelves, and that they did not kill them for food; which is very unlikely, ſince it is certain, and Dr. Sykes admits, they killed them for ſacrifice.

Upon the whole therefore, notwithſtanding all the Doctor hath advanced, I cannot ſee reaſon to depart from the opinion I before eſpouſed, that there was no permiſſion to eat animal food till after the flood.

* Maimonides, rabbi Levi Ben Gerſon, and Abarbanel. Vid. Outram. de ſacrificiis, p. 9.

† Hom. xii. ad Popul. Antioch. tom. 2. edit. Benedict. p. 129.

offering, and was pleaſed with the offerer *. Grotius declares himſelf of the ſame opinion †, and produces among others, the following paſſages in ſupport of it: the firſt out of the prophet Jeremy, "For I ſpake not unto your fathers, neither commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings or ſacrifices (*a*)." Again, out of the Pſalms, "I will not reprove thee for thy ſacrifices, or thy burnt offerings, to have been continually before me. I will take no bullock out of thy houſe, nor he-goats out of thy folds.—Will I eat the fleſh of Bulls, or drink the blood of goats? Offer unto God thankſgiving, and pay thy vows unto the Moſt High (*b*)." And in another place, "Thou deſireſt not ſacrifice, elſe would I give it. Thou delighteſt not in burnt offerings (*c*)." Once more, "ſacrifice and offering thou didſt not deſire; mine ears haſt thou opened. Burnt offering and ſin offering haſt thou not required (*d*)." In all which paſſages, and ſome others that might be mentioned, the bleſſed God ſeems to ſpeak with contempt of ſacrifices, not only as unprofitable to him, but as if he did not command them. As for thoſe in the Pſalms, they muſt certainly be underſtood, either in a comparative ſenſe, as importing that ſacrifices were not ſo pleaſing to him as moral obedience; or as expreſſing their inſufficiency to make a proper atonement for ſin; according to the apoſtle "It

* Reſponſ. ad quæſt. lxxxiii. apud opera Juſtin. p. 442. edit. Paris. 1615.

† Vid. annot. in Gen. iv. 3. & in Jerem. vii. 22. præcipuè, de veritat. Relig. Chriſt. lib. v. §. viii.

(*a*) Jerem. vii. 22. (*b*) Pſal. l. 8.—14. (*c*) Pſal. li. 16. (*d*) Pſal. xl. 6.

"It is not poſſible, that the blood of bulls and of goats ſhould take away ſins (*a*);" and as reproving, therefore, the vain dependance of thoſe who reſted upon them for pardon and divine acceptance, without looking by faith to their great antitype, the ſacrifice of Chriſt. It cannot be ſuppoſed the Pſalmiſt meant that God had not inſtituted ſacrifices, becauſe we know he had done it long before his time, by Moſes. But the paſſage in the prophet Jeremy, that God "ſpake not unto the fathers, nor commanded them, concerning burnt offerings and ſacrifices," being ſaid expreſsly to relate to a time prior to the giving of the law at Mount Sinai, namely, to the day of their deliverance out of the land of Egypt; it is from hence inferred, that he did not inſtitute ſacrifices before the promulgation of the law by Moſes. This opinion is zealouſly patronized by the papiſts, in favour of their will worſhip, or appointing religious rites and ceremonies without any divine inſtitution; for ſo, they alledge, did the patriarchs in the caſe of ſacrifices; yet God approved, though he did not command them. The ſame notion is alſo embraced by ſome proteſtants, in order to evade the argument drawn from the typical ſacrifices of atonement, to prove the death of Chriſt a proper expiatory ſacrifice. Sacrifices they plead, were at firſt an human inſtitution, and to prevent their being offered to idols, God condeſcended to the introducing them into his ſervice; not that he approved them as good in themſelves, or as proper rites of worſhip. However thoſe who apprehend, that ſacrifices were originally of divine inſtitution, reply,

(*a*) Heb. x. 4.

1ſt, That Abel is ſaid to have "offered his ſacrifice by faith (*a*);" which muſt imply as its ground and foundation, ſome divine promiſe connected with that rite, and conſequently a divine direction for the performance of it.

Dr. Spencer maintains, that ſacrifices were originally conſidered under the notion of gifts, the effect of which in appeaſing the anger and conciliating the favour of men being obſerved, it was ſuppoſed, they would have the like effect with God, and thereupon was invented the rite of ſacrificing *.

But to this it may be replied, that if both Cain and Abel ſacrificed upon this principle, which muſt be acknowledged to be a wrong one, it will be hard to account for God's accepting the one, and rejecting the other. Beſides, as Dr. Kennicott very juſtly obſerves, the opinion, that ſacrifices would prevail with God, muſt proceed from an obſervation, that gifts had prevailed with men; an obſervation, which Cain and Abel had little opportunity of making †. Not to inſiſt on what he further urges, that gifts could not have been in uſe, till property was eſtabliſhed; which it probably ‡ was not in the days of Cain and Abel.

2dly, The paſchal lamb was expreſsly inſtituted by God himſelf, not only before the giving

(*a*) Heb. xi. 4.

* Spencer de legibus Hebræor. lib. iii. differt. ii. cap. iii. §. 1, 2. tom. 2. p. 762, 763. In the next chapter he attempts to prove at large, that ſacrifices were of human origin, and not of divine Inſtitution.

† Two differt. on the tree of life, and oblations of Cain and Abel, p. 206.

‡ Ibid. Append. p. 252,—254.

ing the law at Sinai, but before the migration of the Iſraelites from Egypt; and that this was a real ſacrifice, is certain, it being called "the ſacrifice of the Lord's paſſover (*a*)" and it being elſewhere ſaid, "Thou ſhalt ſacrifice the paſſover unto the Lord thy God (*b*)." Again, Chriſt, under the notion of our "Paſſover," is declared to be "ſacrificed for us (*c*)." When therefore it is ſaid in Jeremiah, that "God did not ſpeak unto the fathers concerning ſacrifices in the day that he brought them out of Egypt," it cannot mean that he had yet inſtituted no ſacrifices at all. Again further,

3dly, If we conſider how highly God hath reſented, and how ſeverely he hath puniſhed will worſhip in other caſes; particularly, with reſpect to Nadab and Abihu's burning incenſe with ſtrange fire, which the Lord commanded them not; on which they were ſtruck dead on the ſpot (*d*); one cannot ſurely ſuppoſe, he would have ſo highly approved of the patriarchs ſacrificing, as he did, if he had not commanded it.

When God, therefore, ſaith, in the words ſo often cited, "I ſpake not unto the fathers nor commanded them, in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings and ſacrifices," it muſt be taken in connection with the words immediately following, "but this thing commanded I them, ſaying, obey my voice, and I will be your God, and ye ſhall be my people; and walk ye in all the ways, that I have commanded, (rather, ſhall command you,) that it may be well unto you."

(*a*) Exod. xii. 27. (*b*) Deut. xvi. 2. See alſo ver. 5, 6. (*c*) 1 Cor. v. 7. (*d*) Lev. x. 1, 2.

And then with rabbi Solomon Jarchi, and Maimonides, we may underſtand

1ſt, That after God had brought Iſrael out of Egypt he did not firſt ſpeak to them, and command them, concerning ſacrifical rites, but concerning moral obedience. For the beginning of the law they date from the Iſraelites coming to Marah, three days after they had left the Red Sea, where "God made a ſtatute and an ordinance, and where he proved them, and ſaid, If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of the Lord thy God, and wilt do that which is right in his ſight, and wilt give ear to his commandments, and keep all his ſtatutes, I will put none of theſe diſeaſes upon thee, which I have brought upon the Egyptians (*a*)." And this being before the new inſtitution of ſacrifices at mount Sinai, they were in fact not firſt commanded concerning theſe, but concerning moral obedience *. So that theſe jewiſh doctors underſtand the form of expreſſion in Jeremy, as we muſt that of St. Paul, "Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived, was in the tranſgreſſion (*b*);" that is, Adam was not firſt deceived, and was not firſt in the tranſgreſſion, but Eve.

2dly, Theſe words may be very well underſtood in a comparative ſenſe: "God did not command the fathers concerning ſacrifices, but this he commanded them, to obey his voice;" that is, he did not command them concerning ſacrifices, ſo much as concerning moral obedience; "to obey being better than ſacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams (*c*)."

Accord-

(*a*) Exod. xv. 25, 26. * Maimon. More nevoch. part. iii. cap. xxxii. p. 436. Buxtorf. Baſil. 1629.

(*b*) 1 Tim. ii. 14. (*c*) 1 Sam. xv. 22.

Accordingly God is ſaid to deſire mercy, and not ſacrifice (*a*); or mercy rather than ſacrifice. In this manner negatives are frequently uſed for comparatives, "It was not you that ſent me hither but God (*b*);" not ſo much you, as God. "Your murmurings are not againſt us, but againſt the Lord (*c*);" not ſo properly againſt us, as the Lord. "Labour not for the meat that periſheth, but for the meat which endureth to everlaſting life (*d*);" that is, not with ſo much aſſiduity and anxiety for the former, as for the latter.

Upon the whole then, it is moſt probable, ſacrifices were firſt inſtituted by God himſelf, and injoined our firſt parents preſently after the fall; from whom, and afterwards from Noah, all nations received them by tradition *.

However, in proceſs of time theſe, as well as all the other branches of religious faith and worſhip, were miſerably corrupted; inſtead of brute animals, which God had appointed, human ſacrifices grew into uſe, and it became no uncommon thing, in ſeveral countries, for parents to ſacrifice their children. And beſides this change, as to the ſubjects of the ſacrifices, the objects of them were likewiſe altered; the Gentiles "ſacrificing to demons, and not to God (*e*)." When, therefore, God choſe Iſrael to

(*a*) Hoſ. vi. 6. (*b*) Gen. xlv. 8. (*c*) Exod. xvi. 8. (*d*) John vi. 27.

* Againſt the human, and for the divine inſtitution of ſacrifices, ſee the ingenious and learned Dr. Kennicott's two diſſertations on the tree of life, and the oblations of Cain and Abel, p. 201 & ſeq. Witſii Miſcell. tom. 1. lib. 2. diſſert. 2. §. 1,—15. Dr. Outram hath diſcuſſed the arguments on both ſides without determining on either, de ſacrificiis, lib. 1. cap. 1. §. 3,—4. p. 2,—11.

(*e*) 1 Cor. x. 20.

to be his peculiar people and church, among whom he would revive the true religion, he gave them, anew, his law concerning ſacrifices, with the addition of ſuch particular rites, as would make them more ſignificant types of good things to come under the goſpel diſpenſation. For inſtance, whereas formerly the head of every family was, probably, the ſacrificer for his own houſhold, God now appointed a peculiar order of prieſts, with their aſſiſtants the Levites, whoſe whole buſineſs it ſhould be to attend the ſacrifices; by whom therefore they would be more regularly performed, and better preſerved from being corrupted, than in times paſt. It is concerning theſe new inſtituted jewiſh ſacrifices, we are now more eſpecially to diſcourſe.

The general name ſometimes includes all the offerings made to God, or any way devoted to his ſervice and honour. Thus not only offerings of fruits, as well as animals, are called ſacrifices; but likewiſe the moral duties of repentance, thankſgiving and praiſe: "The ſacrifices of God are a broken and a contrite ſpirit (*a*)." Again, "I will offer unto thee the ſacrifice of thankſgiving (*b*)." And, "Let us offer the ſacrifice of praiſe to God. (*c*)."

But, in a ſtricter ſenſe, ſacrifices and offerings were two things; every ſacrifice, indeed, was an offering, but every offering not a ſacrifice. All ſorts of tythes, and firſt fruits, and whatever of their worldly ſubſtance was conſecrated to God, for the ſupport of his worſhip and the maintenance of his miniſters, were offerings,

(*a*) Pſal. li. 17. (*b*) Pſal. cxvi. 17. (*c*) Heb. xiii. 15.

fering, or oblations. These were either of living creatures, or other things; as corn, flour, wine, oil, &c. But sacrifices, in the more peculiar sense of the term, were of living creatures; of which only five sorts were prescribed or allowed by the law; three of beasts, namely, bullocks, sheep, or goats; and two of birds, that is, doves and turtles. Beasts only were allowed in publick sacrifices, and birds in private ones; and that chiefly, when persons were too poor, to provide a more costly sacrifice.

The general design and use of such offerings and sacrifices was partly

1st, As an acknowledgement of their receiving all their good things from the hand of God, and of his right in the whole of that, of which they offered him a part; though to make this act the more significant and expressive, it was a part of almost every thing they had.

2dly, To be a means of repentance and humiliation for sin, of the desert of which they were reminded by the suffering and death of the victim, substituted in their room, and suffering in their stead.

3dly, To typify, and so to assist their faith in, that promised sacrifice of atonement, which the Son of God was to offer in due time. There was also a political use of many of these sacrifices, which we have formerly taken notice of. Dr. Sykes * makes all sacrifices to be federal rites, which imply'd mens entering into friendship with God; or if they had violated their friendship

* Essay on the nature, design and origin of sacrifices, p. 59.

friendſhip with him, then they denoted reconciliation, and a renewal of that friendſhip. He ſuppoſes the fire on the altar repreſented God, who was anciently wont to manifeſt himſelf in a Shechinah or flame; as he did to Moſes in the buſh, and in the holy of holies in the jewiſh tabernacle *. And accordingly thoſe ſacrifices, part of which was conſumed on the altar, and part eat by the offerers, ſignified their being in friendſhip with God, and their deſire of continuing ſo; eating and drinking together being an ancient rite, and token of friendſhip among men. And the whole burnt offering, in which all was given to God, being conſumed on his altar, ſignified their deſire of reconciliation and renewed friendſhip with him; and their acknowledgment of their unworthineſs of it, as they eat of no part of the ſacrifice †.

But as for the notion of the victim's being ſubſtituted, to ſuffer death and be conſumed in the room and ſtead of the tranſgreſſor, for whom it was offered, the Doctor allows it to have been ancient, and commonly received among Gentiles, and Jews, as well as Chriſtians ‡. Thus Ovid, in the ſixth book of his Faſti, ſuppoſes the ſacrificed animal to be a vicarious ſubſtitute, the ſeveral parts of which were given as equivalents for what was due by the offerers:

Cor pro corde, precor; pro fibra ſumite fibras;
Hanc animam vobis pro meliore damus.

Abar-

* Eſſay on the nature, deſign and origin of ſacrifices, p. 337.
† Ibid. p. 232, 233, 277. ‡ Ibid. p. 121.

Abarbanel eſpouſes the ſame ſentiment in his introduction to his comment on Leviticus *: "The perſon, ſaith he, that put his hand upon the head of the beaſt, by this rite confeſſed the deſert of his ſins, and declared the blood of that animal to be ſhed in lieu of his own; and that it was juſt and right, that the offender's life ſhould be taken away, as was that of the beaſt brought to the altar." And Dr. Outram † abundantly ſhows, that it was the common opinion of the rabbies, "that the blood of the ſinner in equity ought to have been poured out, and his body burnt; as was the blood of the victim poured out, and its body burnt; and that God in his mercy and goodneſs took the victim inſtead of, and as an expiation for, the offender." Thus they underſtand a tranſlation of ſin upon the head of the victim, and likewiſe of the puniſhment due to the offender. Dr. Sykes utterly rejects this notion, of ſacrifices being vicarious and expiatory; and endeavours to confute it with the following arguments.

1, It is not any where expreſsly ſaid, or ſo much as hinted, in the Old Teſtament, that the victim's life was given in lieu of, or as a vicarious ſubſtitute for, the life of him that offered it ‡." To this we anſwer,

There was no need of its being expreſsly ſaid, it being well known and univerſally underſtood, to be the true intent and meaning of killing the victim. Of this fact numerous teſtimonies

* Abarbanel. Exord. Comment. in Levit. ad. calcem Maimon. de ſacrificiis per Du Viel, p. 301.

† Outram. de ſacrificiis, lib. 1. cap. xxii. §. v,—xii. p. 269,—278.

‡ Eſſay on Sacrifices, p. 122.

ſtimonies might be added to thoſe already cited, from the moſt ancient writers of ſeveral nations. It is ſtrange he ſhould ſay, it is not ſo much as hinted in the Old Teſtament; where there are ſo many caſes, in which a perſon having done ſomething that according to the law forfeited his life, upon a victim's being ſlain and ſacrificed for him, whereby an atonement was made for his tranſgreſſion, the forfeiture was reverſed, and thereupon his life was ſpared. However this notion is expreſsly advanced in the New Teſtament, in relation to the death of Chriſt; which is ſaid to be "an offering and ſacrifice to God (*a*);" and he is ſaid to have "put away ſin by the ſacrifice of himſelf (*b*);" and to have "ſuffered for ſins, the juſt for the unjuſt (*c*);" and to have died for us, in the ſame ſenſe that one man may die for another; that is, to ſave the other from dying by ſuffering death in his ſtead (*d*). And this is founded on the ſuppoſition, that the victim's life was given in lieu of, or as a vicarious ſubſtitute for, the perſon for whom it was offered.

2dly, the Doctor pleads, that in ſome caſes, atonement was made for ſin without any animal ſacrifice, and without any life being given: therefore piacular ſacrifice did not imply giving life for life *. Thus, when a poor man, who could not be at the expence of an animal ſacrifice, had forfeited his life by ſome tranſgreſſion of the law, he was indulged with offering an handful of fine flour only, and with that "the prieſt was to make atonement for the offender, as touching his ſin that he had ſinned (*e*)."

I re-

(*a*) Eph. v. 2. (*b*) Heb. ix. 26. (*c*) 1 Pet. iii. 18.
(*d*) Rom. v. 6, 7, 8. * p. 123,—126. (*e*) Lev. v. 13.

I reply, This by no means proves, that when an animal piacular ſacrifice was offered, it did not imply giving life for life. It only ſhows, God might, if he pleaſed, accept of a lower atonement for the forfeited life of the offender. And it is a remarkable inſtance of his compaſſionate indulgence to the poor, that he would accept of ſome flour only, to be burnt and deſtroyed on his altar, as a vicarious ſubſtitute for thoſe lives, or perſons, who deſerved to be deſtroyed.

3dly, The Doctor argues, that if the deſign of animal ſacrifices had been to give life for life, maſtation alone would have been ſufficient; and there would have been no occaſion for the ſubſequent rite of burning the blood upon the altar, that was to attend it*. To this we reply,

If the only end and deſign of piacular ſacrifices had been, to give life for life, there might have been ſome weight in this argument. But as the tranſgreſſor of God's law had not only forfeited his natural life, but had incurred future puniſhment, it made the ſacrifice more properly and ſignificantly vicarious, that, after it was killed, the fleſh ſhould be burnt with fire, and utterly conſumed on the altar. And as for the מנחה minchah, or meat offering, that was to attend it and be conſumed along with it, it might naturally ſignify the forfeiture of their ſubſtance, as well as their lives, into the hands of divine juſtice.

4thly, The Doctor obſerves, that no where, in the books that particularly mention the inſtitution of ſacrifices, or largely treat about them

* p. 126,—134.

them, or in the verſions of them, are they ever called λυτρα, αντιλυτρα or αντιψυχα. equivalents, compenſations, exchanges, ſubſtitutes, or by any other word, which implies giving life for life *. I anſwer,

We are not much concerned, what word the ſeptuagint, or any other verſion, hath uſed for ſacrifices. But ſince the Doctor ſeems to allow, that if they were called λυτρα, or αντιλυτρα, that would imply their vicarious ſubſtitution; I think it a ſubſtantial argument, that they really were ſo, that the death of Chriſt which is expreſsly ſaid to be a ſacrifice for the ſins of men, is ſaid to be a λυτρον (a), and αντιλυτρον (b). That no word is uſed in the books that mention the "inſtitution of ſacrifices, or ſo largely treat about them, which implies giving life for life," is poſitively aſſerted; and if we ſhould aſſert, that the hebrew word נשא naſa, portavit, ſuſtinuit, which is ſo often uſed concerning piacular ſacrifices, does naturally and ſtrictly imply this, I am perſwaded we ſhould have reaſon and truth on our ſide. As this word is uſed for mens bearing their own ſin, that is, ſuffering the puniſhment of it in their own perſons (c); and for one man's bearing the ſins of another, that is, ſuffering the puniſhment which the other's ſins had deſerved (d); ſo it is alſo uſed for the ſin offering, which is ſaid to "bear the iniquity of the congregation, and to make atonement for them before the Lord (e)." Where to bear the iniquity of the congregation, and to make atonement for their ſins, are plainly the ſame thing; and

* p. 134, 135. (a) Matt. xx. 28. Mark x. 45. (b) 1 Tim. ii. 6. (c) Lev. xxiv. 15. Numb. xiv. 34. & alibi. (d) Ezek. xviii. 20. (e) Lev. x. 17.

and to bear the iniquity of the congregation, according to the common use of the word נשא nasa, is to suffer the legal result of their iniquity, by which comes to the same, a vicarious death and punishment for them. And thus Christ is said to have "borne our griefs and carried our sorrows (a), and to bear the sins of many (b). Once more,

5thly, The Doctor observes, that atonement is required to be made by animal sacrifices, in some cases, where there was no crime committed, and therefore no life forfeited (c). A woman after child bearing is commanded to bring a lamb, or, if not able to do that, two turtle doves, or two young pigeons; the one for a burnt offering, the other for a sin offering, and the priest should make an atonement for her (d). Again, certain animal sacrifices are appointed for the cleansing of a leper (e), by which the priest was to make an atonement for him (f). From these two cases the Doctor argues, that, as in neither of them, any crime is supposed to be committed, nor life forfeited, therefore no vicarious death and punishment could be supposed to be inflicted on the victim; and consequently, the common notion of a substitution in piacular sacrifices, which has so much prevailed in the world, does not at all enter into the scripture notion of making atonement.

But here I would ask, if those persons for whom atonement was made, were not guilty of sin, why was any atonement made for them? since the Doctor himself tells us, that "to

(a) Isa. liii. 4. (b) ver. 12. (c) p. 135, 141.
(d) Lev. xii. 8. (e) Lev. xiv. 10, 21. (f) ver.

make atonement for ſins is to do ſomething, by means of which a man obtains the pardon of them (*a*)." We allow, the woman had not properly contracted guilt by her child bearing, nor the leper by his diſeaſe; but, as the pains of child bearing, and as all diſeaſes, to which the human body is incident, (of which leproſy, according to the account travellers give of it, in the eaſtern countries, ſeems to be the moſt grievous,) are the fruits and conſequences of the apoſtacy, and of ſin, which hath brought theſe calamities on human nature, it was highly proper, that on occaſion of a deliverance from theſe remarkable effects of ſin, there ſhould be an humble acknowledgment made of the deſert of it in general, and a piacular ſacrifice offered for original, and for all actual tranſgreſſions; which I take to be the intent of ſuch ſacrifices on theſe occaſions.

Upon the whole then, I ſee no reaſon, from any of Dr. Sykes's arguments, to depart from the ancient doctrine, which hath ſo univerſally approved itſelf to the reaſon of Gentiles, as well as Jews; namely, that in ſacrifices of expiation and atonement for ſin there was a ſubſtitution of the victim to ſuffer in the room and ſtead of the tranſgreſſor.

Sacrifices are diſtinguiſhed by the jewiſh writers into the moſt holy, and into thoſe of an inferiour kind, or leſs holy *. Of the former ſort were the burnt offerings, ſin offerings, treſpaſs offerings, and peace offerings of the whole

(*a*) p. 306.

* Miſhn. tit. Zebhachim, cap. v. §. 1, and 7. p. 21. and 25. tom. 5. edit. Surenhus. Maimon. de ratione ſacrificiorum faciendorum, cap. i. §. xvii. p. 290. Crenii Faſcic. ſexti.

whole congregation; of the latter, they reckon the peace offerings of particular perſons, paſchal lambs, firſtlings and tenths. Some of them diſtinguiſh them alſo into ſacrifices of duty, to which they were bound by the law, and voluntary ſacrifices, which they offered of their own free will *.

Whatever was offered in ſacrifice, was to be good and perfect in its kind; no beaſt that had any diſtemper, blemiſh, or defect was allowed.

In treating of this ſubject, we ſhall diſtinguiſh ſacrifices, in reſpect

1ſt, To their ſignification and uſe:

2dly, To the perſons that offered them: And

3dly, To the ſubject matter of them.

1ſt, In reſpect to their ſignification and uſe, they are diſtinguiſhed into four kinds, burnt offerings, ſin offerings, treſpaſs offerings, and peace offerings †.

1ſt, The firſt and moſt ancient ſort of ſacrifices were burnt offerings, which the Hebrews call עלות gnoloth, from עלה gnalah, aſcendit; the Greeks ολοκαυτα from ολος totus, and καιω uro; becauſe they were wholly conſumed with fire, except the ſkin, and ſo made to aſcend in flames and ſmoke from the altar. Sacrifices of this ſort are often mentioned by the

* Vid. Reland. Antiq. veterum Hebræor. part iii. cap. 1. §. iii. p. 291, 292. edit. 3. Traject. Bat. 1717.

† This diviſion is ſaid by Maimonides, and Abarbanel, to comprehend every kind of ſacrifices that the law preſcribes, whether publick or private. Vid. Maimon. de ratione ſacrificiorum faciendorum, cap. 1, §. 2. p. 283. Crenii Faſcic. ſexti. & R. Abarbanel. Exord. Comment. in Levit. cap. 2. p. 243. ad calcem Maimon. de ſacrificiis, per De Veil. See likewiſe Maimon. præfat. ad quintam partem Miſhnæ, fol. 1.

Heathens, as well as Jews; particularly by Xenophon, who ſpeaks of ſacrificing holocauſts of oxen to Jupiter, and of horſes to the Sun †. They appear to have been in uſe, long before the inſtitution of the other Jewiſh ſacrifices by the law of Moſes. Abel's was moſt probably of that ſort. However, we expreſsly read of burnt offerings in Job's time (*a*), and in Abraham's (*b*), and as early as Noah, who upon his coming out of the ark, built an altar unto the Lord, and took of every clean beaſt, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings upon the altar (*c*).

Hence it was, that though the Jews would not allow the Gentiles to offer on their altar, any other ſacrifices peculiarly enjoined by the law of Moſes, yet they admitted them by the hands of the Jewiſh prieſts to offer holocauſts, this being a ſort of ſacrifices prior to the law, and common to all nations ‡. During their ſubjection to the Romans, it was no uncommon thing for thoſe Gentiles to offer ſacrifices to the God of Iſrael at Jeruſalem. There is a letter of king Agrippa to Caius in Philo's works, in which it is ſaid, that the emperor Auguſtus ordered a holocauſt of two lambs and a bullock to be offered for him daily, τῳ ὑψίστῳ θεῷ, to the moſt high God, at Jeruſalem §. And hence Tertullian in his apology to

* Outram. de ſacrificiis, lib. 1. cap. x. §. ix. p. 113.

† Ἔθυσαν τῷ Διὶ, καὶ ὁλοκαυτώσαν τὰς ταύρους· ἔπειτα τῷ Ἡλίῳ, καὶ ὁλοκαυτώσαν τοὺς ἵππους. Cyropæd. lib. 8. p. 464. edit. Hutchins. 1738.

(*a*) Job i. 5. chap. xlii. 8. (*b*) Gen. xxii. 13.

(*c*) Gen. viii. 20.

‡ Maimon. de ratione ſacrificiorum faciendorum, cap. iii. §. ii. p. 300. Crenii Faſcic. ſexti.

§ De legatione ad Caium, apud opera, p. 801 E. edit. Colon. Allobr. 1613.

to the Romans, ſays "cujus (Judææ ſc.) & Deum victimis, & templum donis, & gentem fœderibus, aliquandiu honoratis *."

The Jews accounted their holocauſt the moſt excellent of all their ſacrifices. Accordingly it is ſo ſtiled by Philo, in his book de Victimis, who begins with it, and aſſigns this reaſon for giving it the preference, that it redounds ſolely to the divine honour, being entirely conſumed with fire, and leaving therefore no room for ſelfiſhneſs or avarice †. Moſes likewiſe begins the law concerning ſacrifices with thoſe relating to the holocauſt or burnt offering (*a*); and informs us that the creatures proper for ſacrifices were bullocks, ſheep, or goats; and turtle doves, or young pigeons (*b*). The doves and pigeons were chiefly for the poorer ſort of people, who could not go to the price of bullocks and ſheep. The law enjoins a perſon, who had been guilty in ſome articles particularly ſpecified, to "bring his treſpaſs offering unto the Lord, a female from the flock, a lamb or a kid of the goats for a ſin offering; but if he be not able to bring a lamb, then, two turtle doves or two young pigeons, one for a ſin offering and the other for a burnt offering (*c*)." And in like manner, a woman after child bearing is ordered to bring a lamb for a burnt offering, and a dove, or a pigeon for a ſin offering; but if ſhe be not able to bring a lamb, ſhe ſhall bring two turtle doves, or two young pigeons, the one for a burnt offering,

* Tertullian. Apolog. §. xxvi. p. 26. edit. Rigalt. 1675.

† Apud opera, p. 648. B, C. edit. Colon. Allobr. 16[illegible].

(*a*) Lev. i. (*b*) ver. 5, 10, 14. (*c*) Lev. v. 6, 7.

the other for a ſin offering (*a*). It is obſervable, that the poor woman's offering was that which the Virgin Mary made at her purification (*b*).

The burnt offering, as I ſaid, was entirely conſumed by fire: "It is the burnt-offering, becauſe of the burning upon the altar all night until the morning, and the fire of the altar ſhall be burning in it (*c*)." Only the ſkin was the prieſt's due for the trouble of performing the ſacrifice (*d*). It is diſputed among the Jewiſh doctors, on what accounts the holocauſts were offered. Some ſay, to expiate all evil thoughts; as ſin offerings and treſpaſs offerings, all evil actions. Others ſay, to atone for the breach of affirmative precepts, as the latter did for that of negative ones *.

Some chriſtian writers make the holocauſt to be offered to God, as an acknowledgment of his being the Creator, Lord, and Preſerver of all, worthy of all honour and worſhip; and likewiſe as a token or emblem of mens giving themſelves up entirely to him; as they did the victims, which was wholly conſumed on the altar. Accordingly it is ſuppoſed the apoſtle alludes to the holocauſt, when he exhorts us to "preſent our bodies," or ourſelves, "a living ſacrifice to God (*e*)."

But further, ſince the end of the offering was always to make atonement, as is declared in the general law concerning burnt offerings (*f*); which yet it could not do abſolutely and

(*a*) Lev. xii. 6. 8. (*b*) Luke ii. 24. (*c*) Lev. vi. 9. (*d*) chap. vii. 8.

* Outram de ſacrificiis, lib. 1. cap. x. §. vii. p. 111.

(*e*) Rom. xii. 1. (*f*) Lev. i. 4.

and properly (*a*); it muſt therefore be underſtood to do it typically, or in a way of repreſentation. And this was, doubtleſs, its grand intention and uſe, even to typify, and to direct the faith of the Old Teſtament believers to, that only true atoning ſacrifice, which the ſon of God was to offer in due time. Hence Chriſt is ſaid to have "offered up his body once for all," that is, his whole ſelf, his entire human nature (*b*). I have only further to obſerve, that of this kind was the continual ſacrifice, offered every morning and evening, which it was predicted the Meſſiah ſhould cauſe to ceaſe (*c*), and with the abolition of which the jewiſh worſhip and church was brought to a final period.

3dly, The next kind of ſacrifices were the חַטָּאת chattaoth, or ſin offerings, the law and rites of which are laid down and deſcribed in the fourth chapter of Leviticus. The verb חָטָא chata, in kal, ſignifies to ſin; and hence חַטָּאִים chattaim, ſignifies ſinners (*d*). But, in Pihel, it has a different ſignification, namely, to cleanſe, expiate, make atonement or ſatisfaction: "That which was torn, ſaith Jacob to Laban, I brought it not to thee; חִטָּאתִיהָ achattenna, I bore the loſs of it; I made ſatisfaction for it (*e*). Hence the noun חַטָּאת chattaah, is uſed to denote an offering for ſin, whereby pardon is procured, atonement is made, and ſin is expiated. In the ſame ſenſe the apoſtle Paul uſes the Greek word, αμαρτια, in imitation, I ſuppoſe, of the hebrew phraſeology: "Him that knew no ſin, υπερ ημων αμαρτιαν

(*a*) Heb. x. 1,—4, 11. (*b*) ver. 8,—10.
(*c*) Dan. ix. 27. (*d*) Pſal. i. 1. (*e*) Gen. xxxi. 39.

αμαρτιαν εποιησεν, he hath made a sin offering for us (a)." And so the apostle renders the following words of the psalmist, עולה וחטאה olah vachattaah (b), ολοκαυτωματα και περι αμαρτιας "burnt offerings, and sin offerings (c)." Περι αμαρτιας ought undoubtedly to be rendered, where it is said, "God sending his son in the likeness of sinful flesh, και περι αμαρτιας, and by a sin offering, condemned sin in the flesh (d)."

According to the scripture account, these sacrifices were offered,

I. For all sins of ignorance or inadvertency against what are commonly called the negative precepts, or with respect to things forbidden. The case stated in Leviticus is, "If a soul shall sin through ignorance against any of the commandments of the Lord, concerning things which ought not to be done, and shall do against any of them." Notwithstanding this general mode of expression, the rabbies limit the law to those sins of ignorance, which if they had been committed knowingly and wilfully, would have incurred the penalty of "cutting off;" and they tell us they were forty-three in number, which they pretend exactly to enumerate. But the words are express against this rabbinical restriction. "If a soul shall sin through ignorance, מכל מצות miccol mitsoth, against any of the commandments of the Lord (e)." Besides, we find these sacrifices injoined in cases, where the penalty of being

(a) 2 Cor. v. 21. (b) Pſal. xl. 6. (c) Heb. x. 6.
(d) Rom. viii. 3.
* Maimon. de ſacrificiis, tractat. 4. cap. 1. § 1. ii, iv. De Veil. Lond. 1683.
(e) Lev. iv. 2, 3; 13, 14; 22, 23; 27, 28.

being cut off could not be incurred; particularly,

2dly, On occasion of legal pollution, as at the cleansing of a leper (a), and the purification of a woman after child bearing (b), and other legal pollutions, specified in the fifteenth chapter of Leviticus (c).

In the common sin offering, whether private or publick, the fat only was burnt upon the altar, and part of the blood put on the horns of the altar, and part of it poured at the foot of it (d). But the flesh was the due of the priest, to be eaten in the courts of the tabernacle of the congregation (e); and by these, and by the trespass offerings, were the priests chiefly maintained in the weeks of their attendance on the temple service. Besides many particular occasions, on which these sacrifices were offered, there were also constant sin offerings at stated seasons; as on every new moon, a kid of the goats (f); and on the fifteenth day of the passover month, one goat; and so for seven days successively (g); on the day of the feast of trumpets, a kid (h); and at the feast of tabernacles, a kid for seven days together (i).

There were also sin offerings of a more solemn nature, offered on extraordinary occasions, of which the priest had no part, but they were entirely consumed with fire, not, however, on the altar, as the holocausts were, but without the camp, or upon the ground in the open field; only the kidneys and the fat were

burnt

(a) Lev. xiv. 19. (b) chap. xii. 6. (c) chap. xv. 19. 29. 30. (d) chap. iv. 25. 26. (e) chap. vi. 25, 26. (f) Numb. xxviii. 15. (g) ver. 22, 24. (h) chap. xxix. 5. (i) ver. 7, 11 & seq.

burnt on the altar of burnt offering, and part of the blood poured out at its foot; and part of it the priest carried into the sanctuary; with some of which he tinged the horns of the golden altar of sweet incense, and with the rest he "sprinkled seven times before the Lord, before the veil of the sanctuary (a)." Of this sort was the high priest's sin offering bullock, when he "had sinned though ignorance according to the sin of the people (b)." The sacredness of his office was an aggravation of his sin beyond that of others, and his dignity rendered his example in doing evil more hurtful than theirs; for which reason a more solemn sacrifice was appointed to be offered for his sins even of ignorance, than for those of the common people. Of this kind also was the high priest's sin offering bullock on the day of expiation (c); only with this difference, that the blood of it was sprinkled, not before the veil of the sanctuary, but before the mercy seat, in the holy of holies (d).

Of this sort likewise was the sin offering bullock for the sins through ignorance of the whole congregation (e).

The jewish writers are of different opinions concerning the occasion of these sacrifices. Some by the whole congregation understand the sanhedrim, and imagine their sin to be, that they had mistaken in judgment, and by that means misled the people. Others interpret it of any general popular defection from the law of

(a) Lev. iv. 4, 6,—10, 17, 18, 19, 21. (b) ver. 2, 3. (c) chap. xvi. 6. (d) ver. 14. (e) chap. iv. 13.

Maimonides, and the rabbies in general. Vid. Outram de sacrificiis, lib. 1. cap. 14. §. 1. p. 149, 150. and Hottinger de juris Hebræor. leg. cxviii. p. 147, 148. edit. Tigur. 1655.

of God; which through their ignorance of the law was not presently attended to[a]. Thus when Hezekiah restored the true worship of God, after the temple had been shut up, and the daily sacrifices omitted for a considerable time, he offered "a sin offering for the kingdom, and for the sanctuary, and for Judah (*a*)." The sacrifice of Christ, which he offered for the sins of his people, is resembled in scripture to the sin offering of the congregation, because he offered it for all of them in the general; as when he is said to be "made sin;" that is, a sin offering "for us (*b*)." And his sacrifice is represented to be of the same kind with those, whose blood was brought within the sanctuary for sin, and whose bodies were burnt without the camp: "The bodies of those beasts saith the apostle to the Hebrews, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burnt without the camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate (*c*)." The burning of those sacrifices without the camp is to be understood therefore, as typical, not only of Christ's suffering without the gates of Jerusalem, as the apostle applies it; but probably, likewise, of his suffering for the salvation of Gentiles, who were without the camp of Israel, as well as Jews; and the bringing the blood of those sacrifices into the holy place was a figure of Christ's presenting the merit of his death for us, in his heavenly intercession.

3dly,

[a] Aben-ezra. Vid. Outram. l. 1. ad finem, & l. 2. p. 150,—152.

(*a*) 2 Chron. xxix. 21. (*b*) 2 Cor. v. 21. (*c*) Heb xiii. 11, 12. compared with Lev. xvi. 27.

3dly. The third kind of sacrifices were called אשם asham, which we render trespass offering. They in great measure resembled the sin offerings, that it is not easy to distinguish between them. The occasions on which they were offered were much the same; nay, sometimes the same oblations are indifferently called sin offerings, or trespass offering; particularly in the following passage. "And he shall bring his trespass offering אשמו asham unto the Lord for his sin which he hath sinned, אשר חטא חטאתו על asher chata chattatho al. and if he be not able to bring a lamb, then he shall bring for his trespass which he hath committed, אשר חטא על asher chata al, two turtle doves, or two young pigeons, the one for a sin offering חטאת chattath, and the other for a burnt offering (a). Where it is remarkable, that the offence committed is called indifferently a sin and a trespass; and the sacrifice offered a trespass offering and a sin offering. Nevertheless there are some circumstances in which these two kinds of sacrifices are observed to differ. Sin offerings were sometimes offered for the whole congregation; trespass offerings never, but for particular persons. Bullocks were sometimes used for sin offerings, never for trespass offerings. The blood of the sin offerings was put on the horns of the altar, that of the trespass offerings was only sprinkled round about the bottom of the altar. Whence some have concluded, the difference betwixt the sin offerings and the trespass offerings lay only in

(a) See the laws concerning them, Lev. v. and vi. and xiv. 12, 13. and xix. 20,—22. and Numb. vi. 12. Lev. v. 6,—8.

in these circumstances. But others conceive, there must have been some greater difference betwixt them, which was the reason of their being offered with these different circumstances. Yet what that difference was, is variously conjectured by many learned men, rather than asserted by any. Dr. Lightfoot, from the rabbies †, makes the difference to lie in this, that both indeed were offered for the same sort of transgressions, but the אשם, or trespass offering, was to be offered, when it was doubtful, whether a person had transgressed or not. As, suppose he had eat some fat, and was afterwards in doubt, whether it was the fat that belonged to the muscular flesh, which was lawful to be eaten; or the fat of the entrails, which was unlawful; then he was to offer an אשם. But if it were certain, that he knew that he had trespassed, he must offer the חטאת chattaah, or sin offering. Maimonides ‡ is of opinion, that the offences, for which the אשם, was offered, were more heinous than those for which the חטאת chattaah, was offered. Bonfrere, on the contrary, § is of opinion that the offences, expiated by אשם, were more grievous than those expiated by חטאת chattaah. Aben-Ezra makes the chattaah, to signify a sacrifice offered for purging offences committed through ignorance of the law, the אשם for such as were committed through wilfulness.

* See in particular, R. Abarbanel, Exord. Comment. in Levit. p. 307. *

† Lightfoot's temple service, chap. viii.

‡ More Nevochim, part. iii. cap. xlvi. p. 486. edit. & vers. Buxtorf, Basil. 1629.

§ Hieroz. part. i. lib. ii. cap. xxxiii.

it *. Others, again, make the difference to be, that the חטאת chattaah, was for offences proved by witneſſes; the אשם aſham, for ſecret faults, known to others only by the offender's confeſſion. For it is ſaid, "If his ſin which he hath ſinned, בו יודע hodhang elaiv, come to his knowledge, then he ſhall bring his offering (a)." Now יודע hodhang, is of a paſſive ſignification, and here therefore imports, if his fault be made known to him by ſome other perſon, then he muſt offer a ſin offering (b). But elſewhere it is ſaid, "When a perſon has been guilty of any of the things before mentioned, he ſhall confeſs that he hath ſinned in that thing, and he ſhall bring his treſpaſs offering (c)." And to mention only one opinion more; others think the חטאת chattaah, had reſpect chiefly to offences againſt God; and אשם aſham, chiefly to offences againſt men. To this purpoſe Dr. Outram obſerves, that in all caſes where the אשם aſham, is required, there was ſome wrong or injury done him; except in the caſe of the Nazarite defiled by the dead (d), and of the Leper (e). But as both theſe were to be purged with the a chattaah as well as an aſham, he apprehends they afford no material objection to this general rule †.

4, The fourth ſort of ſacrifices were שלמים ſhelamim, or peace offerings; ſo called, not as being intended to make peace with God, but rather to preſerve it. Burnt offerings, ſin offerings,

* Aben-Ezra ad Lev. quoted by Outram, de ſacrificiis, p. 144.

(a) Lev. iv. 28. (b) ver. 29. (c) Lev. v. 5, 6.
(d) Numb. vi. 12. (e) Lev, xiv. 12.

† Outram de ſacrificiis, lib. 1. cap. 13. per totum, p. 135,—147. eſpecially §. viii. p. 143,—145

ferings, and treſpaſs offerings were all offered under the notion of ſome offence committed, and ſome guilt contracted, which they were the means of removing; but in the peace offerings the offerer was ſuppoſed to be at peace with God, and the offering was made rather in a way of thankful acknowledgment for mercies received, or as accompanying vows for the obtaining of further bleſſings; or, in a way of free devotion, as a means of preſerving and continuing peace with God. Thus the peace offerings are diſtinguiſhed into ſacrifices of thankſgiving, votive offerings, and voluntary or free will offerings (*a*). The ſacrifice of thankſgiving, which the ſeptuagint renders θυσια τῆς αἰνεσεως, is evidently referred to in theſe words of the epiſtle to the Hebrews, "By him let us offer the ſacrifice of praiſe to God (*b*)." Some peace offerings were required, by the law, to be offered at certain times, and on particular occaſions; as on the feaſt of Pentecoſt (*c*); by a Nazarite, when he had accompliſhed his vow (*d*); and at the conſecration of the prieſt (*e*). But generally it was referred to the devotion and free will of the people, to offer theſe ſacrifices, when, and how often they pleaſed.

The peace offerings might be either of the flock, or the herd (*f*); that is, either of beeves, or ſheep, or goats; and either male or female. But birds were not allowed; the reaſon of which was probably, becauſe they were too ſmall to admit of being divided into three parts, one for the altar, another for the prieſts, and

(*a*) Lev. vii. 11, 12, 16. (*b*) Heb. xiii. 15. (*c*) Lev. xxiii. 19. (*d*) Numb. vi. 14. (*e*) Exod. xxix. 28. (*f*) Lev. iii. 1, 6.

and a third for the offerer, without bringing the ſacrifice into contempt.

In all peace offerings the fat, that is, the ſuet, as alſo the kidneys, were burnt upon the altar (a); and if the ſacrifice was of the flock, that is, a ſheep or a goat, the rump or tail was burnt along with them (b).

The breaſt and the right ſhoulder were the prieſt's due, and they are called the wave breaſt, and the heave ſhoulder (c), becauſe of the ceremony of waving them this way and that, and upward and downward, which was done by the owner of the ſacrifice, as the form of his preſenting them to God. Theſe portions of the peace offerings were allotted towards the maintenance of the prieſts during the weeks of their attendance at the ſanctuary; for they were not permitted to carry them home with them, unto their own houſes in the country; but they and their families were to "eat them in the place which the Lord ſhould chuſe;" that is the place of his publick moſt ſolemn worſhip by ſacrifice (d).

Along with theſe peace offerings, at leaſt with thoſe of thankſgiving, there was alſo offered bread of fine flour, and oil, both leavened and unleavened, made into cakes and wafers, which were likewiſe the prieſts due (e). The reſt of the fleſh of the peace offerings belonged to the owner of the ſacrifice, with which it was uſual to make a feaſt, and entertain his friends, either on the day of the ſacrifice, or the next day at furtheſt; for if any of the fleſh remained till the third day, it was to be burnt (f).

That

(a) Lev. iii. 3,—5. (b) ver. 9,—11. (c) Lev. vii. 34. (d) Deut. xii. 18. (e) Lev. vii. 12, 13. (f) ver. 17.

Thus the lewd woman in the Proverbs is repreſented, as inviting an unwary youth to a feaſt upon her votive peace offerings (*a*). Theſe feaſts were often kept in the courts of the temple, or in ſome of the buildings adjoining; where there were cook rooms, and conveniencies for dreſſing the fleſh of the ſacrifices; as appears very probable from the account of the ſolemn paſſover which Joſiah kept at the temple, that the Levites "roaſted the paſſover with fire, according to the ordinance; but the other holy offerings ſod they in pots and in caldrons and in pans, and divided them ſpeedily among all the people. And afterwards they made ready for themſelves, and for the prieſts (*b*)." In like manner they did at Shiloh, before the temple was built; where the ſons of Eli, inſtead of contenting themſelves with the breaſt and ſhoulders, which the law aſſigned them for their due, brought up a cuſtom of ſticking a three pronged fork or hook into the cauldron, where the peace offering was boiling, and taking whatever it brought up (*c*).

The Gentiles likewiſe, who borrowed many of their ſacrifical rites from the Jews, uſed ſometimes to hold the feaſts of their peace offerings in the temples of their gods. Hence St. Paul, in the firſt epiſtle to the Corinthians, ſpeaks of their "ſitting at meat in the idols temple (*d*)." But they did not always feaſt upon this fleſh with their friends; they ſometimes ſold it in the common market, as is plainly intimated in the following paſſage of the

(*a*) Prov. vii. 14. (*b*) 2 Chron. xxxv. 13, 14.
(*c*) 1 Sam. ii. 13, 14. (*d*) 1 Cor. viii. 10.

ſame epiſtle, "Whatever is ſold in the ſhambles, that eat, aſking no queſtion for conſcience ſake (a)," that is, as the context leads us to underſtand it, not enquiring whether it had been offered in ſacrifice to a idol.

Thus much for the different ſorts of ſacrifices, in reſpect to their ſignification and uſe.

2dly, Sacrifices may be divided, in reſpect to the perſons that offered them, into publick and private.

1ſt, The publick ſacrifices were offered for the whole people of Iſrael; as two lambs for burnt offerings every day, one in the morning, the other in the evening; which are called the continual burnt offering (b): two lambs more, that is, four, on every ſabbath day (c): two young bullocks, one ram and ſeven lambs for a burnt offering, and a kid of the goats for a ſin offering, every new moon (d): and the ſame ſacrifices every day of the feaſt of unleavened bread, and of the firſt fruits (e). On the day of the feaſt of trumpets, on the great day of expiation, and at the feaſt of tabernacles, there were alſo extraordinary publick ſacrifices appointed (f). Beſide theſe, and ſome other ſtated publick ſacrifices, there were occaſional publick ſacrifices ſometimes offered; as the ſin offering of the congregation, when they had ſinned through ignorance (g). And on occaſion of the war with the Benjamites, "all the children of Iſrael offered burnt offerings and peace offerings before the Lord (h)."

2dly,

(a) 1 Cor. x. 25. (b) Exod. xxix. 42. (c) Numb. xxviii. 9, 10. (d) ver. 11, 15. (e) ver. 17. & ſeq. (f) Numb. xxix. (g) Lev. iv. 13, 14. (h) Judg. xx. 26.

2dly, Private ſacrifices, offered for particular perſons, were either ſtated or occaſional. Of the former ſort was the paſchal lamb, ſacrificed annually for each family; and the high prieſt's ſin offering for himſelf, on the day of expiation (*a*). To this there is a reference in the following paſſage of the apoſtle, "Into the ſecond" tabernacle, or holy of holies, "went the high prieſt alone every year, not without blood, which he offered for himſelf, and for the errors of the people (*b*)."

Occaſional private ſacrifices were offered on account of any treſpaſs, committed againſt the law, or any legal pollution contracted, any vow made, any bleſſing received, &c.

3dly, Sacrifices are again to be diſtinguiſhed, in reſpect to the ſubject matter of them, into bloody or unbloody, or into animal and vegetable.

The animal ſacrifices were of one ſpecies of the herd; namely, the bullock, or cow, including the calf: two of the flock; namely, ſheep and goats: and two of the fowls; namely, doves and pigeons.

The unbloody, or vegetable ſacrifices, of which we are to ſpeak at preſent, were the מנחות minchoth, and נסכים neſachim, meat offerings and drink offerings. As for the tythes and firſt fruits we ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak of them hereafter.

The meat offerings were either attended with drink offerings, or they were offered alone.

1ſt, The meat offerings, attended with drink offerings, called מנחות נסכים minchoth neſachim, were fine flour, ſalt, and oil, made

(*a*) Lev. xvi. 6. (*b*) Heb. ix. 7.

either into thick cakes, or thin wafers, and baked either in a pan or oven. The drink offering was of wine, which was poured out at the baſe of the altar. Theſe meat and drink offerings were a ſort of appendages to the ſacrifices; they were offered along with all the burnt offerings, except of birds; and with the peace offerings (*a*); but not with the ſin offerings, except that which was offered at the cleanſing a Leper (*b*).

2dly, The meat offerings alone, which were not offered along with animal ſacrifices, were either publick or private.

The publick were the wave ſheaf (*c*), and the twelve cakes of ſhew bread (*d*).

The private were either enjoined by the law, as that of the prieſt at his conſecration (*e*), and that which the jealous huſband was to offer (*f*); or they were allowed in caſe of poverty, when the perſons could not afford a more coſtly ſacrifice (*g*).

The meat offerings were all of white flour, except that of the jealous huſband, which was of barley meal without any mixture; and the wave ſheaf, which was not ground into flour; all the reſt were fine wheat flour, ſeaſoned with ſalt (*h*). Some were mixt with oil, or frankincenſe, or both (*i*). Some were offered unbaked, others baked.

Some were eat by the prieſts, without bringing them to the altar at all; as the leavened cakes, and the ſhew bread.

Some

(*a*) Numb. xv. 3, &c. (*b*) Lev. xiv. 10. (*c*) Lev. xxiii. 10, 11. (*d*) Lev. xxiv. 5. (*e*) Lev. vi. 20. (*f*) Numb. v. 15. (*g*) Lev. v. 11. (*h*) Lev. ii. 13. (*i*) ver. 15.

Some were wholly conſumed on the altar, as every meat offering for a prieſt (*a*).

But as to the moſt of them, a memorial or ſmall part was conſumed on the altar; the reſt belonged to the prieſt (*b*).

Thus I have given you a brief account of the jewiſh ſacrifices. I ſhall only further obſerve, that if a perſon, obliged by the law to offer any of theſe ſacrifices, refuſed to do it he was puniſhed even with "cutting off." But the Jews were generally ſo zealouſly attached to their law, that there was very rarely any occaſion for inflicting puniſhment upon this account. If a man, who lived at a great diſtance from Jeruſalem, had fallen under an offence, which required him to make a ſin or a treſpaſs offering, the rabbies ſay, he might defer it till the next ſolemn feſtival, when all were obliged to appear before the Lord at the national altar *.

(*a*) Lev. vi. 23. (*b*) Lev. ii. 2, 3.

* See on this ſubject Maimonides de ſacrificiis, Abarbanel's exordium comment. in Levit. and Outram de ſacrificiis.

CHAP. VI.

Of the PROPHETS.

CONCERNING the prophets we ſhall firſt conſider the name, and then the duty and buſineſs of the prophetick office.

As to the name, there are three different words, by which prophets are denominated in ſcripture; namely, רואה חוזה נביא roeh, chozeh, nabhi, which are all found in one paſſage, where we read of Samuel הראה haroeh, Nathan הנביא hannabhi, and Gad החוזה hachozeh (*a*). The word נביא nabhi, is by ſome derived from בוא bo venit, intimating that God came to the prophet by the divine afflatus. Thus Ezekiel ſaith, ותבא בי רוח vattabo bi ruach, which we render, "and the ſpirit entered into me (*b*)." Some light, perhaps, may be hereby given to that remarkable promiſe of Chriſt, "If any man love me, he will keep my words, and I and my father will love him, and we will come and make our abode with him (*c*);" namely by the continual influence of the ſpirit on his heart.

But

(*a*) 1 Chron. xxix. 29. (*b*) Ezek. ii. 2. (*c*) John xiv. 23.

But others derive נביא nabhi, from נוב nubh, provenire, from whence comes ניב nibh, germen, fructus, a word metaphorically applied to ſpeech, which is called the fruit ניב nibh, of the lips (*a*); and it is ſaid the mouth of the juſt bringeth forth ינוב janubh, wiſdom (*b*). Propheſy, therefore, being the fruit of the lips in conſequence of divine inſpiration, the prophet is called נביא nabhi. In the firſt place wherein this word occurs, it is applied to Abraham: "Reſtore the man his wife, for he is a prophet, and he ſhall pray for thee, and thou ſhalt live; but if thou reſtore her not, thou ſhalt die (*c*)." Where a נביא nabhi, is ſuppoſed to be a friend of God, whom he would not ſuffer to be wronged, and whoſe prayers were very prevalent with him. Accordingly by the pſalmiſt God is repreſented as ſaying, "touch not mine anointed and do my prophets no harm (*d*)." And from the following paſſage of Jeremiah, it appears to have been the ſpecial buſineſs of the נביאים nebhiim or prophets, to pray for the people: "If they be prophets, and if the word of the Lord be with them, let them now make interceſſion to the Lord of hoſts, &c (*e*)." And their prayers are ſuppoſed to be very prevalent with God: "Though Moſes and Samuel ſtood before me, yet my mind could not be towards this people (*f*)." When, therefore, God was determined to bring judgments upon the Iſraelites, he forbad Jeremiah the prophet to pray for them: "Then ſaid the Lord unto me, Pray not for this people for their good (*g*)."

(*a*) Iſa. lvii. 19. (*b*) Prov. x. 31. (*c*) Gen. xx. 7. (*d*) Pſal. cv. 15. (*e*) Jerem. xxvii. 18. (*f*) Jerem. xv. 1. (*g*) Jerem. xiv. 11.

The other two names of a prophet חוזה choſeh, and ראה roeh, ſeem to be ſynonimous, both ſignifying, one that ſeeth or diſcerneth; the former from חזה chazah, and the latter from ראה raah, vidit. And indeed it is hard to ſay, how theſe three names or titles differ in their ſignification.

It ſhould ſeem, the word ראה roeh, was the more ancient denomination of the prophet; but in the days of Samuel the word נביא nabhi, was grown into more common uſe; as appears from the following paſſage; "He that is now called a prophet נביא nabhi, was before-time called a ſeer ראה roeh (*a*)." Here a conſiderable difficulty ariſeth; for we do not any where meet with the word ראה roeh, in the ſcripture hiſtory before this time, whereas the word נביא nabhi, is common in the writings of Moſes; who is therefore by ſome ſuppoſed not to have been the author of the Pentateuch, a word commonly occurring therein, which it ſeems was not uſed till long after his days.

One ſolution, that has been offered, is, that the word נביא nabhi, though in common uſe in the days of Moſes, was not uſed in the ſame ſenſe, as ראה roeh was in the days of Samuel, namely for a revealer of ſecrets, or a man by whom God was to be conſulted; but that anciently it only ſignified a friend of God, one who had an intimacy with him. But this is hardly reconcileable with the character of a נביא nabhi, or prophet, deſcribed in ſeveral places of the Pentateuch (*b*), as one to whom God makes himſelf known by viſions, or dreams,

(*a*) 1 Sam. ix. 9. (*b*) Numb. xii. 6. Deut. xiii. 1. and chap. xviii. 22.

dreams, who gives miraculous ſigns of his divine miſſion, and foretels things to come. And ſurely ſuch a one muſt be as capable of revealing ſecrets, as any ראה roeh, or ſeer in after times.

Others ſolve the difficulty, by ſuppoſing the word ראה roeh, was anciently in vulgar uſe, and being eſteemed a low word, which would have been unſuitable to the purity and dignity of Moſes's ſtyle, he for that reaſon always uſes the politer word נביא nabhi; but that in Samuel's time נביא nabhi, was alſo grown into common and vulgar uſe. No doubt there might be words in the Hebrew, as there are in our language, which are decently enough uſed in converſation, but are hardly thought proper for the pulpit or for any grave compoſitions. Of this ſort might have been the word ראה roeh; but as the language grew more refined it was of courſe dropt, and the more polite word nabhi ſubſtituted in its room, both in converſation and in writing. It is obſerved in confirmation of this opinion, that the word ראה roeh, is but very ſeldom uſed in the ſacred writings.

After all, I know not whether two lines of Horace in his art of poetry, will not ſuggeſt the eaſieſt ſolution of this difficulty,

Multa renaſcentur, quæ jam cecidere; cadentque
Quæ nunc ſunt in honore vocabula, ſi volet uſus. l. 70, 71.

The word נביא nabhi, might have been common in the days of Moſes, it might have grown much out of uſe in ſome centuries afterwards

terwards, when רֹאֶה roeh, was uſed inſtead of it; and nevertheleſs be revived and become common in the days of Samuel.

Thus much for the name; we now come to conſider the thing, or the duty and buſineſs of a prophet.

A prophet in the ſtrict and proper ſenſe was one to whom the knowledge of ſecret things was revealed, that he might declare them to others *, whether they were things paſt or preſent, or to come: the woman of Samaria perceived our Saviour was a prophet by his telling her the ſecrets of her paſt life (*a*). The prophet Eliſha had the preſent conduct of his ſervant Gehazi revealed to him (*b*). And moſt of the prophets had revelations concerning future events; above all, concerning the coming and kingdom of the Meſſiah: "He has raiſed up a horn of ſalvation for us in the houſe of his ſervant David, as he ſpake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been ſince the world began (*c*)." Nevertheleſs in a more lax or analogical ſenſe, the title prophet is ſometimes given to perſons who had no ſuch revelation, nor were properly inſpired. Thus Aaron is ſaid to be Moſes's prophet: "The Lord ſaid unto Moſes, ſee I have made thee a god unto Pharoah, and Aaron thy brother ſhall be thy prophet (*d*):" becauſe Aaron received the divine meſſages, which he carried to Pharoah immediately

* Maimon. Præfat. in Miſhn. p. 4. edit. Surenhus. Appellabant Prophetam, Videntem, quod res futuras, antequam exiſterent, prævideret.

(*a*) John iv. 19. (*b*) 2 Kings v. 26. (*c*) Luke i. 69, 70. The rabbins ſay, all the prophets propheſied concerning the Meſſiah. Vid. Cod. Sanhedrin, cap. xi. §. xxxvii. p. 362. Coceii excerpt. Gemar.

(*d*) Exod. vii. 1.

diately from Moſes; whereas other Prophets received their meſſages immediately from God himſelf. In this reſpect, as Moſes ſtood in the place of God to Pharaoh, ſo Aaron acted in the character of his prophet.

The title of prophets is given alſo to the ſacred muſicians, who ſung the praiſes of God, or who accompanied the ſong with muſical inſtruments. Thus "the ſons of Aſaph, and of Heman, and of Jeduthun," are ſaid to "propheſy with harps, with pſalteries and with cymbals (*a*);" and they "propheſied, it is ſaid, according to the order of the king (*b*)." Upon which R. S. Jarchi remarks, they propheſied when they played upon theſe muſical inſtruments. We alſo read in the ſtory of Saul's advancement to the kingdom of Iſrael, that he met "a company of prophets coming down from the high place with a pſaltery and a tabor and a pipe and a harp before them; and they propheſied, and he with them (*c*)." What kind of prophecy this was is evident; it was praiſing God with ſpiritual ſongs, and the melody of muſical inſtruments. Perhaps Miriam, the ſiſter of Aaron, may be called a propheteſs only on this account, that ſhe led the concert of the women, who ſung the ſong of Moſes with timbrels and with dances (*d*). Thus the heathen poets, who ſung or compoſed verſes in praiſe of their gods, were called by the Romans, vates, or prophets; which is of the ſame import with the greek προφητης, a title, which St. Paul gives to Epimenides a cretan poet (*e*).

This

(*a*) 1 Chron. xxv. 1. (*b*) ver. 2. (*c*) 1 Sam. x. 5, 10. (*d*) Exod. xv. 20, 21. (*e*) Tit. i. 12.

This notion of prophets and propheſying may give ſome light to the following paſſage in the firſt epiſtle to the Corinthians (*a*), "Every woman, praying or propheſying with her head uncovered, diſhonoureth her head." Propheſying cannot be underſtood in the ſtricter ſenſe of foretelling things to come, nor even of interpreting the holy ſcriptures by divine inſpiration; in which ſenſe the word ſeems to be uſed, when the apoſtle, diſcourſing of ſpiritual gifts, prefers the gift of prophecy above all others, becauſe, ſaith he, "he that propheſieth ſpeaketh unto men for edification and exhortation and comfort (*b*)." However, neither of theſe kinds of propheſying will ſuit with the deſign of the apoſtle, when, in the paſſage we are now conſidering, he ſpeaks of a woman's propheſying in the church or congregation; for there ſhe was not permitted to ſpeak, nor ſo much as to aſk a queſtion for her inſtruction, much leſs to teach and inſtruct others (*c*). In order to ſolve the difficulty, ſome would have the word προφητευουσα to be taken paſſively, and to ſignify, a hearing or being preſent at propheſying: but this is an acceptation of the term contrary to the rules of grammar, and without example either in ſcripture or in any profane author. Beſides, though ſhe may properly enough be ſaid to pray, as joining with the miniſter, who is the mouth of the congregation to God; yet with no propriety can ſhe be ſaid to propheſy, only as attending on the preaching of the miniſter, who is conſidered as the mouth of God to the congregation.

Perhaps,

(*a*) 1 Cor. xi. 5. (*b*) 1 Cor. xiv. 3.

Perhaps, then, propheſying may here mean, (as we have ſhewed it does mean in other places) praiſing God in pſalms and hymns. And thus praying and propheſying are fitly joined together, theſe being the two parts of publick worſhip, in which the whole congregation is ſuppoſed to unite *.

We have obſerved, that a prophet, in the ſtrict and proper ſenſe, was one, to whom the knowledge of ſecret things was revealed, in order that he might declare them to others. Of ſuch prophets the talmudiſts reckon forty eight from Abraham to Malachi, and ſeven propheteſſes †. It is remarkable, that though to make up their catalogue, they take in Eldad and Medad, mentioned in the book of Numbers (*a*); concerning whom, however, it does not appear, that they revealed any ſecret; but their propheſying was no more than exhorting the people to obedience to God, to which they were moved and in which they were aſſiſted by the holy ſpirit, as were the reſt of the ſeventy elders (*b*); notwithſtanding this, I ſay, they do

* Vid. Mede's Diatrib. diſc. xvi. on 1 Cor. xi. 5. p. 58. & ſeq. of his works. Smith in his diſcourſe on prophecy, apprehends, that ſinging was called prophecy, when the ſongs or pſalms were compoſed under the influence of the divine ſpirit, to the ſound of muſical inſtruments. Perhaps ſome of the prophets having uttered ſuch inſpired compoſitions to muſick, might give occaſion to the more general application of the term to all who ſung divine hymns, accompanied with inſtrumental muſick. See Smith's ſelect diſcourſes, p. 230, 232.

† Vid. Megill. fol. 14, 1. & R. S. Jarchi ad loc. Vid. etiam notam Vorſtii ad p. 124. Maimon. tract. de fundament. Legis, edit. Amſtel. 1680.

(*a*) Numb. xi. 26.

(*b*) ver. 25.

do not admit Daniel into the liſt *, nor place his writings among thoſe of the prophets, but only among the hagiographa †; which they reckon of the leaſt authority of all the canonical books. The reaſons they aſſign for it, as they are recited by the authors of the ancient univerſal hiſtory ‡, are

1ſt, That Daniel was a courtier, and ſpent his life in luxury and grandeur in the ſervice of an uncircumciſed king.

2dly, That the ſpirit of prophecy was confined to the land of Canaan, out of which he lived all his life. And ſome have added a

3d, Reaſon; namely, that he was made a eunuch, according to Iſaiah's propheey, which he delivered to Hezekiah (*a*); and ſuch were excluded from entering into the congregation of the Lord: though Aben-Ezra vindicates him from this imputation (*b*).

R. Johanan is repreſented in the Gemara as caſting a ſtill more injurious reflection on him; namely, that he ſtole into Egypt to buy hogs, at the time Nebuchadnezzar ſet up his golden Image, and his three friends, Shadrach, Meſhech and Abednego were thrown into the fiery furnace for refuſing to worſhip it §.

After

* Vid. Cocceii excerpt. Gemar. cod. Sanhedr. cap. xi. §. xvi. p. 324. edit. Amſtel. 1629. Hi (nempe Hagæus Zacharias & Malachias) præfabant ipſi, qui eſſent prophetæ, quam Daniel non fuerit propheta. Ipſe illis major ob viſam viſionem.

† Maimon. More Neboch. part ii. cap. xlv. p. 318, 319. edit. Buxtorf. Baſil. 1629.

‡ Hiſt. of the Jews, book i. chap. vii. ſect. iii. ſub fin. note.

(*a*) 2 Kings xx. 18. (*b*) Aben-ezra in Daniel.

§ Vid. cod. Sanhedrim, cap. xi. §. xiii. apud Cocceii excerpt. Gemar. p. 320. edit. Amſtel. 1629.

After all it is eaſy to diſcern, what was the true cauſe of the rancour, which many of the rabbies have diſcovered againſt this eminent prophet; it is, becauſe he has ſo clearly predicted and aſcertained the time of the Meſſiah's coming, which is long ſince elapſed; and becauſe of the great advantage which the Chriſtians have hereby obtained in their arguments againſt the Jews. Therefore, I ſay, though their hiſtorian Joſephus was ſo far from denying him the title of a prophet, that he has in ſeveral reſpects given him the preference to the reſt of the prophets *; and notwithſtanding the high character that is given of him in the prophecy of Ezekiel (*a*), wherein he is ranked with Noah and Job, men of eminent righteouſneſs and piety; nevertheleſs ſeveral of the rabbies, though not all †, have ſpitefully endeavoured to ſink his character below that of a prophet, or even of a good man.

Malachi has been commonly reckoned by the Chriſtians the laſt prophet ‡ under the Old Teſtament diſpenſation, with whom the ſpirit of prophecy ceaſed four hundred eighty-ſix years before Chriſt. Nevertheleſs Joſephus mentions ſeveral others, who during thoſe ages predicted various future events by the ſpirit of prophecy; as

* Antiq. lib. x. cap. xi. §. 7. p. 543. edit. Haverc.

(*a*) Ezek. xiv. 14.

† Vid. Hottinger. Theſaur. philolog. lib. ii. cap. i. ſect. iii. p. 511. edit. Tigur. 1649.

‡ So ſaith the Talmud likewiſe. Vid. Cocceii excerpt Gemar. Sanhedr. cap. i. §. xiii. p. 156. Tradunt Magiſtri, ex quo mortui ſunt prophetæ poſteriores, Haggæus, Zacharias, Malachias, ablatus eſt ſpiritus ſanctus ab Iſraele.

as one Judas an Eſſene *, Sameas †, Mahanem ‡, and Hircanus the high-prieſt, the fourth of the Aſmonean princes from Judas Maccabeus, is ſaid by Joſephus to be honoured with three of the higheſt dignities, being a prophet, as well as prince and high-prieſt. In his antiquities he gives two inſtances of his prophetick gift §. However that be, we have good authority to add John the baptiſt to the liſt of prophets under the Old Teſtament; though his hiſtory is recorded in the New; for he lived and propheſied before the kingdom of God, or the Meſſiah's kingdom was ſet up. Accordingly our Saviour diſtinguiſhes the time, in which John the baptiſt lived, from the time of the kingdom of God, or the goſpel diſpenſation. "Among thoſe that are born of women, there is not a greater prophet, than John the baptiſt; but he that is leaſt in the kingdom of God, is greater than he (*a*);" that is, on account of the clearneſs of the goſpel revelation, by means of which ordinary Chriſtians may know more of the glories of divine grace, than any of the Old Teſtament prophets, or even John himſelf knew.

On the ſame account we may add to the liſt of the Old Teſtament prophets, Zechariah the father of John, "who was filled with the holy Ghoſt and propheſied (*b*);" and likewiſe Simeon, and

* Antiq. lib. xiii. cap. xi. §. 2. p. 665. edit. Haverc. Ιούδαν τινα Εσσηνον μεν το γενος, ἑτέρους δε ὑπερ ὁτις προσιτι διαψευσαμενον παλιθις.

† Lib. xv. cap. i. §. 1. p. 740.

‡ Ibid. cap. x. §. 5. p. 777.

§ Lib. xiii. cap. x. §. 3. p. 662. and cap. xii. §. 1. p. 666.

(*a*) Luke vii. 28. (*b*) Luke i. 67.

and Anna the propheteſs (*a*). Indeed ſome of the jewiſh rabbies will not allow that the ſpirit of prophecy ever quite departed from them; but they tell us of a certain λαμπαδια or torch of prophecy, one ſhining when another was ſet. R. Kimchi gives us this myſtical gloſs upon the following paſſage in the firſt book of Samuel, "And it came to paſs at that time, when Eli, was laid down in his place, and his eyes began to wax dim, that he could not ſee, and ere the lamp of God went out in the temple of the Lord, where the ark of God was, and Samuel was laid down to ſleep, that the Lord called Samuel (*b*)!" I ſay, R. Kimchi, gloſſing on theſe words, ſaith, this is ſpoken myſtically concerning the ſpirit of prophecy; according to the ſaying among our doctors, "The ſun riſeth, and the ſun ſetteth; that is, e'er God makes the ſun of one righteous man to ſet, he makes the ſun of another righteous man to riſe."

But, leaving the jewiſh whims and fables concerning the number of their prophets, we proceed to enquire concerning the manner in which the revelation was made, both by God to the prophets, and by them to the people.

However before we directly conſider the manner, in which God revealed ſecrets to the prophets, it will be proper to premiſe a few words concerning the qualifications of a prophet, or the pre-requiſites to a man's receiving the ſpirit of prophecy.

The firſt and moſt eſſential qualification of a prophet was true piety. This is the conſtant ſenſe and opinion of the jewiſh doctors *. To

(*a*) Luke ii. 25, 36. (*b*) 1 Sam. iii. 2,—4.

* Maimon. Moreh Nebhoch. part. ii. cap. xxxii. p. 284.

which agree those words of St. Peter, "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost (*a*)." Yet this general rule is not without exceptions; for God, on special occasions, and for particular purposes, sometimes vouchsafed the prophetick spirit to bad men; as to Balaam, "who loved the wages of unrighteousness." However, it may well be supposed, that none but good men were stated prophets, so as to be frequently favoured with the divine afflatus; and especially that none but such were honoured with being employed as the writers of any part of the canon of scripture. Insomuch that the assertion of St. Peter concerning the written prophecies of the Old Testament is true without exception.

We may, perhaps, reasonably account for the ceasing of the spirit of prophecy from among the Jews in the latter ages of their polity, till it was revived at the coming of our Saviour, from their universal degeneracy and corruption in religion and morals.

2dly, The mind of the prophet must be in a proper posture and frame for receiving the divine afflatus, or prophetick spirit. That is, say the doctors, it must not be oppressed with grief, or disturbed with passion of any kind. Their tradition says, that Jacob did not prophesy all the time of his grief for the loss of Joseph; nor Moses for a long time after the return of the spies, who brought an evil report of the land of Canaan, because of his indignation against them *. And by the holy spirit, which David prays might not be taken away, but

(*a*) 2 Pet. i. 21.

* Maimon. Morch Nebhoch. cap. xxxvi. p. 295, 296.

but reſtored to him (*a*); the chaldee paraphraſt, and the hebrew commentators, underſtand the ſpirit of prophecy, which, they ſay, was withdrawn on account of his ſorrow and grief for his ſhameful miſcarriage in the matter of Uriah. And when he prays, that God would "make him to hear joy and gladneſs (*b*)," they underſtand it of a chearful frame of mind, which would fit him for receiving the prophetick afflatus; and "the free ſpirit, with which, he prays he might be upheld (*c*)," they interpret of a ſpirit of alacrity and liberty of mind, free from the oppreſſion of grief, or diſcompoſure of paſſion.

In order to prove, that paſſion diſqualified a man for receiving the prophetick afflatus, they alledge the ſtory of Eliſha in the third chapter of the ſecond book of Kings: When the kings of Judah, and Iſrael, and Edom, in their diſtreſs for water during an expedition againſt Moab, came to Eliſha, to enquire of God by him, the prophet ſeems to have been moved with indignation againſt the wicked king of Iſrael, addreſſing him in the following manner, "What have I to do with thee? get thee to the prophets of thy father, and to the prophets of thy mother; ſurely if it were not that I regard the preſence of Jehoſaphat, the king of Judah, I would not look upon thee, nor ſee thee (*d*)." However, being willing to oblige Jehoſaphat, "he called for a minſtrel, and it came to paſs, when the minſtrel played, that the hand of the Lord came upon him (*e*)." The uſe of the minſtrel ſeems to be to calm his paſſion, and

(*a*) Pſal. li 10, 11. (*b*) ver. 8. (*c*) ver. 12.
(*d*) 2 Kings iii. 12, 13. (*e*) ver. 15.

compoſe his mind, that he might be fit to receive the divine afflatus.

This may perhaps ſuggeſt to us one reaſon, why the prophets practiſed muſick (*a*); namely, becauſe of its tendency to compoſe their minds, and to free them from all ſuch melancholly or angry paſſions, as would render them unfit for the ſpirit of prophecy. We find this remedy ſucceſsfully applied to Saul's melancholly: "And it came to paſs, when the evil ſpirit from God was upon Saul, that David took an harp, and played with his hand; ſo Saul was refreſhed, and was well, and the evil ſpirit departed from him (*b*)." This evil ſpirit was perhaps originally nothing but melancholly, or grief and anguiſh, which however, through divine permiſſion, was wrought upon and heightened by the inſinuations of ſome evil ſpirit, which at times, it ſeems, inſtigated him to propheſy: "It came to paſs on the morrow, that the evil ſpirit came upon him, and he propheſied in the midſt of the houſe (*c*)." which the targum of Jonathan renders, inſanivit in medio domûs; and rabbi Levi Ben Gerſhon gloſſes upon it thus, "He ſpake in the midſt of the houſe very confuſedly, by reaſon of the evil ſpirit." But why this ſhould be called propheſying, is not eaſy to determine, unleſs he ſometimes ſung in his raving fits, ſince ſinging is called propheſying, as we have already ſhewn. Mr. Henry ſuppoſes Saul pretended a religious extaſy, imitating the motions and geſtures of a prophet, with a deſign to decoy David into a ſnare, and put him off from his

(*a*) See 1 Sam. x. 5. (*b*) 1 Sam. xvi. 23.
(*c*) 1 Sam. xviii. 10.

his guard, and perhaps, if he could kill him, to impute it to a divine impulſe. However that was, Saul's original diſorder was probably melancholly, for which muſick was a proper remedy. And ſo it is often ſtill found to be; particularly, for the deep melancholly occaſioned by the bite of a Tarantula, which is ordinarily cured by this means. You may ſee a great variety of inſtances of the powerful effects of muſick in calming the paſſions of the mind, and in ſome caſes curing the diſorders of the body, produced by Bochart in his Hierozoicon *.

We come now to conſider the manner, in which God revealed ſecrets to the prophets; which the apoſtle ſaith, was πολυτροπως, "in divers manners (*a*)," as by dreams, viſions, inſpirations, voices and angels.

1ſt, By dreams and viſions. I join theſe together, ſince they ſeem to be ſometimes uſed as ſynonymous terms; and viſions import no more than prophetick dreams. Thus Nebuchadnezzar's dream is called the viſions of his head (*b*). And ſo is Daniel's dream (*c*). This is properly what we are to underſtand by a "Viſion of the night (*d*) in the book of Job, and God is ſaid to "ſpeak in a dream, in a viſion of the night (*e*)." And in Geneſis God "ſpake unto Iſrael in the viſions of the night (*f*)." Nevertheleſs, in ſome other places, viſions ſeem to be diſtinguiſhed from dreams; as in the following paſſage, "Your old men ſhall dream dreams, and your young men ſhall

* Part. i. lib. ii. cap. xliv. p. 461,—465. oper. vol. ii. 1712. (*a*) Heb. i. 1. (*b*) Dan. ii. 28. (*c*) chap. vii. 1. (*d*) Job xx. 8. (*e*) Job xxxiii. 14, 15. (*f*) Gen. xlvi. 2.

ſee viſions (*a*)." When a viſion is diſtinguiſhed from a dream, I conceive it denotes the repreſentation of things made to the imagination of the prophet, while he is awake. Perhaps the difference betwixt prophetick dreams and viſions, may be much the ſame, as betwixt common dreams and a delirium in a fever; in which the patient, though awake, imagines he ſees things and perſons that are not preſent, and of which therefore his ſenſes give him no notice.

Such was the viſion that St. Peter ſaw in a trance or extaſy (*b*). For he ſaw it, not upon his bed in the viſions of the night, but on the houſe top about noon, while he was at prayer (*c*). Such perhaps was Paul's viſion of the third heavens (*d*); though whether this was not more than a viſion Paul himſelf could not inform us: "Whether in the body I cannot tell; or out of the body I cannot tell; God knoweth." That is, whether celeſtial objects were repreſented to him in a viſion only; or whether his ſoul was really for a time ſeparated from his body, and tranſlated into the heavenly regions. However, by the way, we may ſurely conclude from St. Paul's uncertainty on this head, that the ſoul is ſomething quite diſtinct from the body, which can exiſt and act, and receive and underſtand celeſtial things in a ſtate of ſeparation from it; otherwiſe the ſoul muſt have had this viſion in the body, or not at all, and it could have been no doubt with St. Paul, whether at this time he was in the body or out of the body.

Again,

(*a*) Joel ii. 28. (*b*) Acts xi. 5. (*c*) Acts x. 9, 10.
(*d*) 2 Cor. xii. 1, 2, 4.

Again, the word viſion is applied not only to ſuch imaginary repreſentations, but to real miraculous appearances made to the ſenſes. Thus the angel's appearing to Zechariah in the temple is called a viſion (*a*). Sometimes the word is uſed in a laxer ſenſe, for any kind of divine revelation; as the voice which the child Samuel heard in the tabernacle, is called a viſion, though it does not ſeem to have been accompanied with any ſenſible appearance (*b*). The books of the prophecies of Iſaiah, Obadiah and Nahum are expreſsly called their viſions; though it does not ſeem probable, that all the revelations, contained in them, were conveyed to the prophets by viſionary repreſentations.

It has been inquired, how the prophets could certainly diſtinguiſh theſe prophetick dreams and viſions, from common dreams, and from enthuſiaſtical and diabolical deluſions; for which purpoſes ſeveral criteria have been aſſigned by jewiſh and chriſtian writers: For inſtance

1ſt, Divine dreams and viſions are ſaid to have been known by the extraordinary majeſty and ſplendor of the appearance, or the ſtrength and vigour of the repreſentation made to the prophet, and the livelineſs of his perception of it (*c*); which, ſometimes, was ſuch, as the feeble powers of nature could hardly ſuſtain *.

(*a*) Luke i. 22.
(*b*) 1 Sam. iii. 15.
(*c*) See Dan. vii. 8. viii. 27. x. 8.

* Maimon. de fundament. legis, cap. vii. §. iii. p. 98, 103. edit. & interpret. verſtii, Amſtel. 1680.

2dly, During the divine extaſy the prophet had the full exerciſe of his reaſon *; whereas diabolical poſſeſſions and inſpirations threw him into a fit of madneſs. So Virgil deſcribes the Sybill, when the prophetick afflatus came upon her, as perfectly diſtracted and raving.

——Subito non vultus, non color unus,
Non comptæ manſere comæ: ſed pectus anhelans,
Et rabie fera corda tument; majorque videri,
Nec mortale ſonans: Afflata eſt Numine quando
Jam propriore Dei.

Æneid VI. l. 47. & ſeq.

3dly, The ſubject matter of divine viſions and revelations, it is ſuppoſed, was always ſerious, weighty and important; ſuch as it became the wiſdom and holineſs and majeſty of God to reveal.

After all, if we are content without being wiſe above what is written, we muſt frankly acknowledge, we do not certainly know what thoſe criteria were. But of this we may be ſure, and it is ſufficient, that God, who has an abſolute power over the hearts and ſpirits of men, can give any man certain evidence and aſſurance in his own breaſt, that a revelation which

* This is agreeable to the definition, which Maimonides gives of prophecy, that it is an influence of the Deity firſt upon the rational, and then upon the imaginative faculty, by the mediation of the active intellect. Vid. Moreh nebhoch. part ii. cap. xxxvi. p. 292. compare cap. xxxviii. eſpecially p. 300. De veris prophetis tantum loquutus ſum, ut nempe excipiam eos,—qui nulla rationalia, neque ſapientiam habent, ſed nudas tantum imaginationes, & cogitationes. Reaſon therefore, according to this judicious rabbi, was always in exerciſe during the prophetick extacy.

which he is pleaſed to vouchſafe, does indeed come from him; otherwiſe, God would be ſuppoſed to be the moſt impotent of all rational beings, who while he is capable of conveying his mind to his creatures, is incapable of making them ſenſible that he does ſo. When Jacob awoke out of his ſleep, he certainly knew (by what criterion we cannot tell) that the viſionary dream, with which he had been favoured, was of God (*a*). Pharaoh, though a heathen king, knew his dream was extraordinary and prophetick, as appears by his ſpirit being ſo troubled about it, and by his ſending for all the magicians and wiſe men of Egypt to explain it to him (*b*). And Nebuchadnezzar was ſure he had had an extraordinary prophetick dream, though he could not recollect it. Otherwiſe we cannot ſuppoſe, he would have been ſo exceeding angry at the wiſe men of Babylon, for not revealing and explaining it to him (*c*). And no doubt God gave Abraham likewiſe ſuch irreſiſtable evidence and aſſurance, that it was he who commanded him to ſacrifice his ſon Iſaac, as overcame all the reluctance of paternal affection, and whatever reaſon might object againſt ſo unnatural a ſacrifice, or he would never have ſet about it.

Thus much for the criteria by which the prophets might know, that their dreams or viſions and other revelations came from God.

Before we have done with this head, it will be proper to enquire, by what criteria other perſons might judge and be aſſured, that the revelations,

(*a*) Gen. xxviii. 16. (*b*) Gen. xli. 8. (*c*) Dan. ii. 12.

revelations, which the prophets delivered, were true divine revelations.

Here it must be observed, that if the prophet delivered any thing, that was contradictory to the invariable law of nature, it was to be rejected, and he was to be treated as a false prophet, even though he produced miracles in evidence of his mission from God (*a*). For it was a much more supposeable case, that the devil might counterfeit miracles, than that God would contradict the immutable law of nature.

But if nothing which the prophet delivered, was contrary to that law, then his divine mission might be evidenced various ways:

1st, By the sanctity of his own life *, which afforded very probable ground to believe, that he did not counterfeit and pretend revelations, which had not been made to him. Upon this evidence Herod regarded John the baptist as a divine prophet. He "feared John, knowing that he was a just man and holy (*b*)."

2dly, By the testimony of other prophets of undoubted veracity †. Thus Moses bore testimony to Joshua, when he gave him a charge in the name of God before all the congregation (*c*). And John the baptist, whom the Jews acknowledged to be a prophet, bore witness to Christ (*d*).

3dly,

(*a*) Deut. xiii. 1,—3.

* Maimon. de fundament. legis, cap. vii, §. i, ii, p. 87,—89. edit & interpret. Vorstii, Amstel. 1680.

(*b*) Mark vi. 20.

† Maimon. de fundament. legis, cap. x. §. ix. p. 147.

(*c*) Deut. xxxi. 23.

(*d*) John i. 29, 30.

3dly, Sometimes his miſſion was proved by miracles; as the miſſion of Moſes to the people of Iſrael (*a*), and afterwards to Pharaoh (*b*).

4thly, At other times, by ſome ſudden and remarkable judgment from God, upon ſuch as ſlighted and rejected the meſſage he delivered in the name of the Lord; as on Jeroboam, when he commanded the man of God to be taken into cuſtody for the prediction he delivered (*c*); and in the caſe of Elijah's calling down fire from heaven, to conſume the captains and troops of the king of Samaria (*d*).

5thly, By the accompliſhment of his predictions: whereas if what he foretold, did not come to paſs, he was to be treated as a falſe prophet (*e*). Yet this rule was not to hold concerning the predictions of judgments, but only of good things or favourable events (*f*). But as for prophetick threatnings, they were ſuppoſed to be conditional, and that the judgments or puniſhments denounced might be averted by repentance. It is evident the Ninevites underſtood Jonah's prediction of the deſtruction of their city in forty days, in this ſenſe, though delivered without any condition expreſſed (*g*). Otherwiſe, they would have had no encouragement to repent, in hopes that thereby the judgment might be averted (*h*). It was therefore, no evidence againſt Jonah's being a true prophet, commiſſioned of God, that this his prediction was not fulfilled *.

It

(*a*) Exod. iv. 1,—10. (*b*) Exod. vii. 9.
(*c*) 1 Kings xiii. 1,—6. (*d*) 2 Kings i 9,—12.
(*e*) Deut. xviii. 22. (*f*) See Jerem. xxviii. 9.
(*g*) Jon. iii. 4. (*h*) ver. 9.

* Maimon. de fundament. legis, cap. x. §. ii.—viii.

It is very proper, while we are upon the ſubject of prophetick dreams and viſions, to enquire, whether the accounts of the ſeveral ſymbolical actions, ſaid to be done by the prophets, are hiſtories of real facts, or only relations of their dreams and viſions. Such as Iſaiah's walking naked and bare foot three years, "for a ſign and wonder" upon Egypt and Ethiopia (*a*); Jeremiah's hiding his girdle in a rock by Euphrates (*b*), Ezekiel's mock ſiege of Jeruſalem (*c*), Hoſea's taking a wife of whoredom (*d*), and ſeveral others.

Learned men of conſiderable reputation have been divided in their ſentiments on this queſtion. Abarbanel and R. Solomon among the Jews, and the generality of chriſtian writers before Calvin, underſtood theſe narratives in the literal ſenſe, as hiſtories of real facts. On the other ſide, Aben-Ezra and Maimonides * and ſince Calvin, ſeveral other chriſtian writers take them to be only relations of prophetic dreams and viſions.

The principal argument alledged to prove theſe actions were really done, is, that ſeveral of them are ſaid to be ſigns to the people: as Iſaiah's walking naked and barefoot, Ezekiel's mock ſiege of Jeruſalem (*e*), and his removing his houſhold goods (*f*). Now, it is ſaid, how could that be a ſign to any people, which never was preſented before them, but only acted in the imagination of the prophet? To this, however it may be replied that theſe expreſſions, "this ſhall be a ſign," or "I have ſet thee to be

(*a*) Iſai. xx. 2, 3. (*b*) Jerem. xiii. 4, 5.
(*c*) Ezek. iv. (*d*) Hoſ. i. 2.
* Vid. Maimon. Moreh nebhoch, part ii. cap. xlvi.
(*e*) Ezek. iv. 3. (*f*) Ezek. xii. 6.

be a ſign to the houſe of Iſrael," were a part of the dream or viſion; the prophet imagining not only that he ſaw and did certain things or actions, but that he heard ſuch declarations concerning the end for which they were deſigned. Theſe were therefore imaginary ſigns given to imaginary perſons; but when afterwards the viſion was revealed to the real perſons, for whoſe uſe it was intended, it muſt have the ſame effect upon them, (provided they believed it to be a divine viſion), as if it had been a real fact, and tranſacted before their eyes. And thus what was done in viſion was properly a ſign to them, to whom it was declared and applied by the prophet.

On the other hand to prove that thoſe ſymbolical actions of the prophets were done only in imagination, or that the accounts of them are mere narratives of the prophets dreams or viſions, it is alledged,

1ſt, That ſeveral of the things, ſaid to be done, are highly improbable, if not impoſſible to be really performed. For inſtance, that Iſaiah ſhould walk naked and barefooted three years together, ſummer and winter, even if you underſtand by his being naked, merely being without his upper garment: that Jeremiah ſhould ſend yokes to the king of Edom, and to the king of Moab, and to the king of the Ammonites, and to the king of Tyrus, and to the king of Zidon (*a*); and that he ſhould take ſo long a journey, as from Jeruſalem to the Euphrates, which is about five hundred miles, to hide his girdle in a rock; and that after it was rotted, he ſhould take the ſame long

(*a*) Jerem. xxvii. 3.

long journey to fetch it back again (*a*); and that he should take a wine cup from God, and carry it up and down to all nations far and near, even all the kingdoms which are upon the face of the earth, and make them drink it; is more than improbable (*b*). So likewise that Ezekiel should actually eat a roll, which God gave him (*c*); and that he should lie upon his left side three hundred and ninety days together, and after that forty days together on his right side, with bands upon him, that he could not turn from one side to the other (*d*), is not only extreamly improbable upon several accounts, but hardly possible to be done in the time allotted to this whole affair; for it all passed betwixt the prophet's seeing his first vision at the river Kebar, which was on the fifth day of the fourth month, in the fifth year of king Jehoiachin's captivity (*e*), and his sitting in his house with the elders of Judah on the fifth day of the sixth month of the sixth year (*f*); that is, within a year and two months. Now the jewish year, being lunary, consisted of three hundred fifty four days, and their month of twenty-nine days, and thirty days alternately; therefore a year and two months, (three hundred fifty four, twenty nine and thirty added together) could amount to no more then four hundred and thirteen days; which falls short of the number of days, during which the prophet is said to lie on his side, namely, four hundred and thirty days, by seventeen days. And if you deduct also, from the four hundred and thirteen days, the seven days which he sat among the

(*a*) Jerem. xiii. 4, 6, 7. (*b*) Jerem. xxv. 15,—29. (*c*) Ezek. iii. 1, 3. (*d*) Ezek. iv. (*e*) Ezek. i. 1, 2. (*f*) Ezek. viii. 1.

the captives at Telabib (*a*), there remains but four hundred and ſix days; which are twenty four days ſhort of four hundred and thirty.

The only colour of an anſwer, which I have met with to this argument, is, that poſſibly this might be an embolymean year, in which a whole month was intercalated; as it was once in three years; or more exactly, there were ſeven embolymean years in nineteen, in order to reduce the lunar year to the ſolar. On this ſuppoſition indeed, there will be time enough for the prophet's lying on his ſide, in the literal ſenſe, four hundred and thirty days. But this ſolution is too ſubtle for common readers. Four hundred and thirty days, with the addition of ſeven days when the prophet ſat at Telabib, amount to a year and near three months in common computation; and can it be thought the ſacred writer would have allotted but a year and two months for the whole affair, (ſuppoſing it to be a hiſtory of real fact,) without the leaſt hint, how the glaring contradiction, which would ſtare every body in the face on the firſt reading, might poſſibly be reconciled?

To this head of impoſſibles we may refer God's bringing Abraham abroad into the field, and ſhewing him the ſtars (*b*); ſince it appears, that it was not yet ſun ſet: "when the ſun was going down, it is ſaid, a great ſleep fell upon Abraham (*c*)." From whence it is manifeſt, that his going out before to view the ſtars, his ordering ſeveral living creatures for ſacrifice, and his driving away the fowls that came down upon the carcaſes, were all performed in prophetic viſion only; as is indeed intimated when it

(*a*) Ezek. iii. 15. (*b*) Gen. xv. 5. (*c*) Ver. 12.

it is ſaid, "The word of the Lord came unto Abraham in a viſion (*a*)."

2dly, There are ſome things ſaid to be done by the prophets, in their narratives of theſe ſymbolical actions, which could not be really done without ſin; and therefore we may conclude, that neither did God order them, nor did they really do them; but all was tranſacted in the prophet's imagination in a dream or viſion only. Thus the prophet Hoſea is ſaid, at the command of God, to take a wife of whoredom, that is, a whore, and to have three children by her, which are called the children of whoredom, that is, baſtards (*b*). Thoſe, who will have this to be real fact, alledge that ſhe is called a wife of whoredom; which intimates, they ſay, that though ſhe had been a lewd perſon, yet the prophet was legally married to her. But they forget, that the children, which ſhe bore him, are called children of whoredom. Beſides, he is ordered to "love another woman an adultereſs (*c*);" and is ſaid to have bought or hired her for "fifteen pieces of ſilver, and an homer and an half of barley, to abide with him many days (*d*)." Circumſtances, which evidently point out a lewd miſtreſs, not a lawful wife.

Now can it be ſuppoſed, that the prophet Hoſea, the chief ſcope of whoſe prophecy is to diſcover ſin, and to denounce the judgments of God upon a people that would not be reformed, would himſelf be guilty of ſuch an immoral and ſcandalous practice, as to cohabit with one harlot after another? Much leſs can it

(*a*) Gen. xv. 1. (*b*) Hoſ. i. 2. (*c*) Hoſ. iii. 1.
(*d*) ver. 2.

it be thought, that God would have commanded him ſo to do. It is far more likely, that the whole narrative is a relation of his prophetick dreams, in which matters were repreſented to his ſenſes, that would by no means have been fit to be done in reality; which dreams furniſhed out an awakening and very inſtructive parable to the people of Iſrael and Judah, who were intended by the two harlots.

3dly, A further argument to prove, that theſe ſymbolical actions were only performed in the imaginations of the prophets, is drawn from their own narratives, by the learned Mr. Smith in his diſcourſe on prophecy *. He obſerves, that the prophets uſe a different ſtyle, when relating their imaginary ſymbolical actions, and when ſpeaking of what they really did. In the former caſe, they commonly ſpeak in the firſt perſon; as "I did ſo and ſo," and the Lord ſaid ſo and ſo to me; whereas in the latter caſe, they ſpeak of themſelves in the third perſon, after the manner of hiſtorians relating a matter of fact. Thus, after an account of one of theſe ſymbolical actions, namely, "the prophet's getting a potter's earthen bottle, and taking with him the ancients of the people, and the ancients of the prieſts, and conducting them to the vally of the ſon of Hinnom, and there breaking the bottle before them (*a*);" it follows, "then came Jeremiah from Tophet, whither the Lord had ſent him to prophecy, and he ſtood in the court of the Lord's houſe (*b*)." Now Mr. Smith ſuppoſes,

* See Smith's ſelect diſcourſes, diſcourſe on prophecy, chap. vi. p. 218. edit 2, Cambridge, 1673.

(*a*) Jerem. xix. (*b*) ver. 14.

poſes, that when the prophet thus ſpoke of himſelf in the third perſon, he relates ſome real fact; and that Jeremiah, therefore, really wore a yoke on his neck, which the falſe prophet Hananiah broke (*a*). However, this obſervation will hardly hold univerſally; for Hoſea relates the ſtory of his cohabiting with the former adultereſs in the third perſon (*b*), and of his cohabiting with the ſecond in the firſt perſon (*c*). Yet there is no reaſon to believe, one was real fact, any more than the other. Though this argument, therefore, muſt be acknowledged to be ingenious, no ſtreſs can be laid upon it. And ſo the two former arguments, it is preſumed, are ſufficient to ſatisfy us, that many of the ſcripture narratives of the ſymbolical actions of the prophets are only relations of their prophetick dreams or viſions.

2dly, Another way, in which ſecrets were revealed to the prophets, was by inſpiration; that is, when ſomething was ſuggeſted to the mind of the prophet while he was awake, without any ſuch ſcenical repreſentation to his imagination or fancy, as is made in dreams and viſions. The jewiſh writers diſtinguiſh inſpiration into ſeveral degrees, the chief of which, and indeed all that are worth our notice, are what they call רוח הקדש ruach hakkodheſh, or the holy ſpirit, and the Gradus Moſaicus, the degree of Moſes, which they make to be the higheſt of all.

The 1ſt, רוח הקדש ruach hakkodheſh, is thus diſtinguiſhed by Maimonides when a man perceives ſome power to ariſe within and reſt upon him, which urgeth him to ſpeak; inſomuch that,

(*a*) Jerem. xxviii. 10. (*b*) Hoſ. i. (*c*) Hoſ. iii.

that, under this impulſe, he either diſcourſes concerning arts and ſciences, or utters pſalms and hymns, or uſeful and ſalutary precepts for the conduct of life, or matter political and civil, or ſacred and divine; and that while he is awake, and has the ordinary uſe and vigour of his ſenſes; this is ſuch a one, concerning whom it is ſaid, that he ſpeaks by the holy ſpirit *. And thus St. Peter ſays, that "prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men ſpake as they were moved by the holy ghoſt (*a*)." Such was the inſpiration of Zecharias, of whom it is ſaid, that "he was filled with the holy ghoſt and prophefied (*b*);" and alſo of his wife Elizabeth, who "was filled with the holy ghoſt, and ſpake with a loud voice, &c (*c*)." What they delivered was immediately ſuggeſted to their minds by the holy ghoſt. This kind of inſpiration was calm and gentle, and did not throw the prophet into thoſe fears and conſternations and diſorders of body, which the prophetick dreams and viſions ſometimes did †. But he continued, all the time the afflatus was upon him, in full poſſeſſion of himſelf. And by this circumſtance divine inſpiration was diſtinguiſhed from the pſeudoprophetical ſpirit of the Heathens, and other pretenders to prophecy; which if it did, indeed, without diſſimulation, enter into any

* Maimon. Moreh neboch, part ii. cap. xlv. p. 317.

(*a*) 2 Pet. i. 21. (*b*) Luke i. 67, (*c*) ver. 41, 42.

† See Jerem. xxiii. 9. Ezek. iii. 14. Dan. vii. 15. viii. 27. Hab. iii. 2. and perhaps to this claſs we may alſo refer Iſai. xxi. 2, 3, though Jonathan the targumiſt and ſome others underſtand the prophet as here ſpeaking in the perſon of the Chaldeans, and repreſenting the horrors and anguiſh that ſhould come upon them.

perſon; its energy ſeems to have been meerly on the imagination or fancy, which was thereby ſo diſturbed, that the prophet was thrown into a ſort of fury or madneſs. Thus Virgil repreſents the Sybil as diſtracted and raving when the prophetick afflatus came upon her in a paſſage quoted before. The Pythian propheteſs is deſcribed by Lucan *, as full of fury, when ſhe was inſpired by the prophetick ſpirit, and uttering her oracles with her hair torn, and foaming at the mouth, with many antic geſtures. And Caſſandra is repreſented by Lycophron, as propheſying in the ſame manner †.

This ſort of enthuſiaſtic extacy was accounted by the primitive fathers to be a ſure diagnoſtick of a falſe prophet. Hence Miltiades made it an objection againſt the Montaniſts ‡; and Clemens Alexandrinus ſaith of thoſe who made falſe pretences to prophecy, that they propheſied being in an extaſy, like the ſervants of the devil §." Tertullian, who was a friend to the Montaniſts, grants, they were ſometimes exatical in their prophetic dreams or viſions, but denies they fell into any rage or fury, which, he ſeems to admit is the character of a falſe prophet ‖. St. Jerom, in his preface to Iſaiah ſays, " the prophets did not ſpeak in extaſies, neither did they ſpeak they knew not what; nor were they, when they went about to inſtruct others, ignorant of what they ſaid, themſelves." St. Chryſoſtom is of the ſame opinion §§. " It is the property of a diviner, ſays he, to be exatical, to undergoe

* Lucan, lib. v. l. 142,—218. paſſim † Lycoph. Caſſandr. ab init. ‡ Euſeb. Eccleſ. Hiſtor. lib. v. cap. xvii. p. 232, 233. edit. Cantab. 1720. § Strom. lib. i. p. 311. D. edit. Paris. 1641. ‖ Tertull. de Animâ, cap. xlv. p. 297. D. edit. Rigalt. §§ Vid. Hom. xxix. in 1 Cor.

dergoe ſome violence, to be toſſed and hurried about like a madman; but it is otherwiſe with the prophet, whoſe underſtanding is awake, and his mind in a ſober and orderly temper; and he knows every thing he ſaith." Hence we may infer, what opinion theſe fathers would have entertained of the exatic fits of the modern french prophets, quakers, methodiſts and moravians.

The energy of the pſeudoprophetick ſpirit is further repreſented as irreſiſtable by the prophets themſelves; ſo that they could not withſtand it, nor ſuppreſs it's dictates, but muſt immediately utter what it ſuggeſted. Thus Virgil repreſents the Sybil, in her raving fit, as ſtriving, but in vain, to ſhake off the prophetick afflatus, while it returned upon her with ſo much the more violence, and forced her to utter prophecies.

" At Phœbi nondum patiens, immanis in antro
" Bacchatur vates, magnum ſi pectore poſſit
" Excuſſiſſe Deum; tanto magis ille fatigat
" Os rabidum, fera cordadomans finitque premendo. Æneid VI. l. 77, &c.

On the contray, the true prophets were only φερομενοι απο πνευματος αγιε (*a*), " moved by the holy ghoſt," as we render it. The word imports a more gentle influence and ſuggeſtion, without any thing of force and violence upon the mind; ſuch an influence as no way diſturbed and hindered, but rather promoted, the exerciſe of reaſon and prudence. For the verb φερω ſignifies to uphold, ſupport, bear, or carry; as the tree bears fruit (*b*); and as Chriſt is

 ſaid

(*a*) 2 Pet. i. 21. (*b*) John xv. 5.

ſaid to "uphold all things by the word of his power (*a*), φερων τε παντα, &c. The ſenſe of which may perhaps be expreſſed by thoſe beautiful lines of Virgil,

Principio cœlum, ac terras, campoſque liquentes
Lucentemque globum lunæ, titaniaque aſtra
Spiritus intus alit, totamque infuſa per artus
Mens agitat molem, & magno ſe corpore miſcet.
Æneid. VI. l. 724, & ſeq.

And the prophets of God being thus moved by the ſpirit in the full exerciſe of their own reaſon and prudence, may give light to that paſſage of the apoſtle Paul, "The ſpirits of the prophets are ſubject to the prophets (*b*);" or as υποτασσεται may perhaps be more juſtly rendered, are under the direction of, or are to be ordered by the prophets; and it is moſt naturally interpreted by Œcumenius *, and Theophylact †, as ſpoken in oppoſition to the heathen prophets, who, when the afflatus was upon them could not be ſilent if they would; whereas a true divine afflatus was ſo far ſubject to the reaſon and diſcretion of the prophet, that he could wait, till it was proper to deliver what had been ſuggeſted to him, and therefore they might all, as the apoſtle directs, propheſy one by one (*c*), and ſo avoid that confuſion and tumult, which ſeveral perſons ſpeaking together

(*a*) Heb. i. 3. (*b*) 1 Cor. xiv. 32.

* Œcumen. comment. in loc. vol. 1, p. 564. D. edit. Paris 1630.

† Theophyl. comment. in epiſt. in loc. p. 288, 289. edit. London. 1636.

(*c*) ver. 31.

gether would neceſſarily occaſion, and to which the ſpirit of God did no way conſtrain them (*a*).

2dly, The higheſt degree of inſpiration is, according to the jewiſh doctors, the Gradus-Moſaicus; which Maimonides makes to excel that of any other prophet in four particulars:

1ſt, That Moſes received his revelation awake, and in the full uſe of his reaſon and ſenſes; whereas God manifeſted himſelf to all other prophets by dreams and viſions, when their ſenſes were locked up, and as it were uſeleſs.

2dly, That Moſes propheſied without the mediation of any angelic power, whereas all the reſt propheſied by the help of the miniſtry of angels.

3dly, That all other prophets were afraid and troubled, and fainted, when the divine afflatus was upon them. But Moſes was not ſo affected; for the ſcripture ſays, "God ſpake unto him as a man ſpeaketh unto his friend."

4thly, That Moſes could propheſy at all times, when he would, which the other prophets could not *.

The firſt and third of theſe diſtinctions differ not at all from the רוח הקדש ruach hakkodheſh; the ſecond is certainly a miſtake, for "the law was given by the diſpoſition of angels, by the hand of a mediator," namely, Moſes (*b*); and the laſt is quite uncertain. We diſmiſs them all, therefore, as not worthy any further notice.

(*a*) 1 Cor. xiv. 33.

* Vid. Maimon. de fundament. legis, cap. vii. §. vi.—ix. p. 96,—104.

(*b*) Gal. *iii.* 19.

As for the preference which the ſcripture gives to Moſes above the other prophets: "There aroſe not a prophet ſince in Iſrael, like to Moſes, whom the Lord knew face to face (*a*)." Le Clerc is for confining it to the time, which had elapſed ſince the death of Moſes to the writing of the chapter in which this paſſage is contained; or we may poſſibly extend it to all the following ages of the Old Teſtament diſpenſation.

Moſes was the greateſt prophet, as God delivered his law by him to Iſrael; as he wrought more miracles than any of the reſt (*b*); and perhaps alſo as he had greater intimacy with God, and had more of the divine will revealed to him, than was revealed to any other; which may be the meaning of "the Lord's knowing him face to face, or ſpeaking to him face to face (*c*)." For in ſuch a ſenſe the phraſe of ſeeing "face to face" is uſed in the following paſſage of the firſt epiſtle to the Corinthians, "Now we ſee through a glaſs darkly, but then face to face (*d*):" importing the clear and perfect knowledge of the heavenly ſtate, in contradiſtinction, not only to the ſcanty knowledge of the jewiſh ſtate and diſpenſation, which is compared to ſeeing only the ſhadow of things; but alſo to the imperfect, though improved knowledge of the goſpel ſtate, which is compared to the ſeeing the image of a thing in a glaſs darkly.

3dly, Another way, in which ſecrets were revealed to the prophets, was by voices; as to the child Samuel (*e*). One would ſuppoſe, this ſhould

(*a*) Deut. xxxiv. 10. (*b*) ver. 11, 12. (*c*) Exod. xxxiii. 11. (*d*) 1 Cor. xiii. 12. (*e*) 1 Sam. iii.

ſhould be as excellent a manner, and as high a degree of revelation as any whatever; and indeed it ſeems to have been the true Gradus Moſaicus, or the manner of God's revealing the law to Moſes; with whom, in the book of Exodus, he is ſaid to have ſpoken face to face, as a man ſpeaks to his friend (*a*); "and in the book of Numbers, mouth to mouth, even apparently." Which manner of revelation is at the ſame time preferred to that by dreams and viſions (*b*). Nevertheleſs the jewiſh doctors make this, which they call the בת־קול bath-kol, filiæ vox ſeu filia vocis, to be the very loweſt degree of prophecy, or rather to ſucceed in the room of prophecy. Rabbi Iſaac, the author of the book Cozri, ſays, "There is a tradition, that the men of the great ſynagogue were commanded to be ſkilled in all ſciences; principally becauſe prophecy was never taken from them, or at leaſt, that which ſupplied it's room; the בת־קול bath kol *." Dr. Lightfoot ſays, that both the talmudical and later rabbies make frequent mention of בת־קול bath kol, which ſerved under the ſecond temple as their utmoſt refuge of revelation. They call it בת־קול bath kol, or the daughter of the voice, in relation to the oracle of Urim and Thummim; which, according to them, was delivered by an articulate voice from the mercy ſeat. But upon the ceſſation of that oracle, this came in its place, which is therefore called the daughter or ſucceſſor of that voice. For an inſtance of the בת־קול bath kol, the doctor gives us this, out of a multitude

(*a*) Exod. xxxiii. 11. (*b*) See Numb. xii. 6.—8.

* Vid. lib. Cozri. part iii. §. xli. p. 216, 217. edit. Buxtorf. Baſil. 1660.

multitude that are to be found in the talmudiſts: "When Jonathan, the ſon of Uzziel, had compoſed the targum of the prophets, there came בת קול bath kol, and ſaid, who hath revealed my ſecrets to the ſons of men? And when he went about to explain the cherubbim, there came בת קול bath kol, and ſaid, it is enough*.

But if the בת קול bath kol, was in reality, what the jewiſh writers pretend, a miraculous voice from God, the daughter ſhould ſeem to be equal with the mother; and it is hard to ſay, on what account this ſort of revelation was inferior to any other. Dr. Prideaux hath cleared up this difficulty, and from another inſtance in the talmud, hath ſhown, what ſort of an oracle the בת קול bath kol, was †. The paſſage which he quotes, out of many more inſtances as he ſays, of the ſame ſort, is this: Rabbi Jochanan and rabbi Simeon Ben Lachiſh deſiring to ſee the face of rabbi Samuel, a babyloniſh doctor, let us follow, ſaid they, the hearing of בת קול bath kol. Travelling therefore near a ſchool, they heard the voice of a boy reading theſe words from the firſt book of Samuel, "And Samuel died (a)." Obſerving this, they inferred, that their friend Samuel was dead, and ſo they found it had happened; for Samuel of Babylon was then dead. This inſtance ſufficiently ſhows us, that their בת קול bath kol, was no ſuch voice from heaven, as they pretended; but only a fantaſtical way of divination of mere human invention. They applied to בת קול bath kol, the next words they accidentally heard from any body's mouth; and

* See Lightfoot's harmony on Matt. iii. 16.
† Connect. part ii. chap. ii. ſub anno 107.
(a) 1 Sam. xxv. 1.

and this they called a voice from heaven, because they fancied that hereby the judgment and decree of heaven were declared, concerning any future events, of which they desired to be pre-informed.

From this account of the בת קול bath kol, we may judge, how absurd it is to imagine, as several divines have done, that St. Peter refers to it, and allows, according to the jewish notion, the voice from heaven to be inferior to prophecy, in the following remarkable passage of his second epistle, which I will recite at large: "For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the father honour and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved son in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard when we were with him in the holy mount. We have also a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well, that ye take heed as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, &c." The voice that St. Peter here speaks of was quite different from the בת קול bath kol, it was the voice of the same God, who spake by his spirit to the prophets; and none of them could be more sure of the divine inspiration by which they wrote their prophecies, than St. Peter and his two companions were, of what they heard and saw on the mount of Christ's transfiguration.

It is a question, however, on what account St. Peter stiles the writings of the prophets a more sure word of prophecy, βεβαιότερον τον προφητικον λογον,

λογον, than that voice from heaven. Some, as Gomarus and Grotius, refer the word βεβαιοτερον to that voice from heaven, by which the Old Teſtament prophecies concerning Chriſt were now made more ſure, or had received an additional confirmation; for βεβαιοω, in ſeveral places of the New Teſtament, ſignifies to confirm (*a*). Otherwiſe, it may be thus underſtood: The writings of the ancient prophets had been more confirmed by the actual accompliſhment of a number of their own predictions, than the teſtimony of theſe three apoſtles, who declared they had heard the voice from heaven, had yet been; and therefore to other perſons, they were βεβαιοτερος λογος, a word more fully confirmed, than this voice from heaven; eſpecially to the Jews, who were firmly eſtabliſhed in the belief of the divine inſpiration of the Old Teſtament prophets; and to them the apoſtle is chiefly writing (*a*).

The ſenſe, in which Dr. Sherlock underſtands this paſſage, ſeems to be the eaſieſt and moſt natural; namely, that the only event, to which the word prophecy here refers, is "the power and coming of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt;" that is, his ſecond glorious appearance for the deſtruction of his enemies, and the ſalvation of his people. Now it was a ſtrong preſumption, that Chriſt would come in glory, that they had already ſeen him glorified on the mount of transfiguration; and it was a further evidence of his power to deliver his ſervants, that God had openly declared him to be his well beloved ſon; but to aſſure them, that he would ſo come

(*a*) This appears from 2 Pet. iii. 1, 2, compared with 1 Pet. i. 1.

come, and ſo uſe his power, they had "a more ſure word of prophecy," the very word of God, ſpeaking by his prophets, both of the Old and the New Teſtament, to whom all futurity is known, to aſſure us of the certainty of this future event *.

It is poſſible, the Jews might learn their divination by בת קול bath kol, from the Heathens, or the Heathens a like ſort of divination from the Jews. For the bath kol was much of the ſame kind with the Sortes Homericæ, and Sortes Virgilianæ, which were much practiſed by the Greeks and Romans, eſpecially after their other oracles ceaſed on the coming of Chriſt. The difference was, the Jews took their oracle from the firſt words they heard any body pronounce; the heathens from the firſt they caſt their eyes upon, on opening Homer or Virgil; in which they endeavoured to diſcover a meaning ſuitable to the matter concerning which they enquired †.

The

* See Sherlock's diſcourſes on prophecy, diſc. 1, eſpecially p. 20,—23.

† Potter's antiquities, vol. I. chap. 15. p. 302.

Dr. Welwood in his memoirs tells this remarkable ſtory of king Charles I. that being at Oxford during the civil wars, he went to ſee the publick library, where he was ſhowed a fine edition of Virgil. And lord Falkland, to divert the king, would have him make trial of his fortune by the Sortes Virgilianæ. Upon which the king opened the book at Dido's imprecation againſt Æneas; where ſhe wiſhed he might be conquered by his enemies, his friends ſlain in battle, and himſelf come to an untimely death,

At bello audacis populi vexatus & armis,
Finibus extorris, complexu avulſus Jüli,
Auxilium imploret, videatque indigna ſuorum
Funera: nec cum ſe ſub leges pacis iniquæ
Tradiderit,

The Chriſtians, when their religion came to be corrupted, adopted this trick of divination from the heathens, only uſing the bible inſtead of Homer or Virgil. The practice appears to have been as ancient as Auſtin, who lived in the fourth century. He mentions it in his hundred and ninth epiſtle to Januarius; and though he diſallows it in ſecular, he ſeems to approve it in ſpiritual affairs. Dr. Prideaux ſays it obtained moſtly in the weſt, eſpecially in France, where for ſeveral ages it was the practice, on the conſecration of a new biſhop, to conſult the bible concerning him, in this way of divination; by which they made a judgement of his life, and manners, and future behaviour; and this they made a part of their publick offices *.

We have many inſtances in hiſtory, of the uſe of theſe Sortes Sanctorum, as they were called; though they were condemned by the council

Tradiderit, regno aut optatâ luce fruatur;
Sed cadat ante diem, mediâque inhumatus arenâ.
Hæc precor. Æneid. IV. l. 615,—622.

The king ſeemed concerned at the augury. Upon which lord Falkland would try his fortune in the ſame manner; but the place he ſtumbled upon, was more ſuited to his deſtiny than the other was to the kings; being the expreſſions of Evander upon the untimely death of his ſon Pallas:

Non hæc, o Palla, dederas promiſſa parenti,
Cautius ut ſævo velles te credere Marti.
Haud ignarus eram, quantum nova gloria in armis
Et prædulce decus primo certamine poſſet.
Primitiæ juvenis miſeræ, bellique propinqui
Dura rudimenta! Æneid. XI. l. 152,—157.

* Prideaux's Connect. part ii. book v. p. 463, 464. edit. 10. See alſo Du Freſne's Gloſſar. in voc. Sortes Sanctorum.

council of Agda anno 506. at the time they were beginning to take footing in France *. However, blind ſuperſtition prevailed above the decree of the council for ſeveral ages, till more light and knowledge ſpringing up at the reformation, thoſe fooleries which had ſo long obtained among Heathens, Jews and Chriſtians, are now in a manner extinguiſhed. Thus much for the third way of revelation, by voices.

As for the fourth, namely, by angels, there ſeems to be no reaſon to make it, as the Jews do, diſtinct from the three former; ſince Moſes received the law, that was revealed to him, by the "miniſtry of angels (*a*)." Probably the viſions, which the prophets ſaw, as well as the voices which they heard, were formed by angels (*b*). And how far their miniſtry might be employed in ſuggeſting things more immediately to the minds of the prophets, who can pretend to determine. Thus much for the manner in which God revealed ſecrets to the prophets.

Godwin obſerves, that for the propagation of learning, colleges and ſchools were in divers places erected for the prophets. The firſt intimation we have in ſcripture of theſe ſchools is in a paſſage of the firſt book of Samuel, where we read of "a company of prophets coming down from the high place with a pſaltery, a tabret, a pipe, and a harp before them and they did propheſy (*c*)." They are ſuppoſed to be the ſtudents in a college of prophets at נִבְעַת gibnath, or "the hill, as we render it, of God." Our tranſlators elſewhere retain the ſame hebrew word, as ſuppoſing it to be the

* Canon 42. Du Pin's Eccleſ. Hiſt. Anno 506. vol. 6. p. 112. (*a*) Gal. iii. 19. (*b*) See Iſa. vi. 3, Dan. viii. 16, 17. Rev. v. 2, &c. (*c*) 1 Sam. x. 5.

the proper name of a place (*a*):" "Jonathan ſmote the garriſon of the Philiſtines, that was in Geba." Some perſons have imagined, that the ark, or at leaſt a ſynagogue or ſome place of publick worſhip, was at this time at Geba, and that this is the reaſon of its being ſtiled in the former paſſage גבעת האלהים gibhnath haelohim, the hill of God. We read afterwards of ſuch another company of prophets at Naioth in Ramah "propheſying, and Samuel ſtanding as appointed over them (*b*)." Ramah, otherwiſe called Ramathaim-zophim, was Samuel's birth-place, where his parents lived (*c*). Some imagine it was called צפים Tſophim, from צפה tſaphah, ſpeculatus eſt, becauſe of the ſchool of the prophets, or ſeers, that was there; for this title צפה tſopheh, is given to the prophet Ezekiel: "I have made thee a watchman, צפה tſopheh, to the houſe of Iſrael (*d*)."

The ſtudents in theſe colleges were called ſons of the prophets, who are frequently mentioned in after ages, even in the moſt degenerate times. Thus we read of the ſons of the prophets, that were at Bethel (*e*); and of another ſchool at Jericho (*f*); and of the ſons of the prophets at Gilgal (*g*). It ſhould ſeem, that theſe ſons of the prophets were very numerous; for of this ſort were probably the prophets of the Lord whom Jezabel cut off; "but Obadiah took an hundred of them, and hid them by fifty in a cave (*b*)." In theſe ſchools young men were educated under a proper maſter, who was

(*a*) 1 Sam. xiii. 3. (*b*) 1 Sam. xix. 19, 20. (*c*) 1 Sam. i. 1. compared with ver. 19. (*d*) Ezek. iii. 17. (*e*) 2 Kings ii. 3. (*f*) ver. 5. (*g*) chap. iv. 38. (*b*) 1 Kings xviii. 4.

was commonly, if not always, an inſpired propher, in the knowledge of religion and in ſacred muſick (*a*), and were thereby qualified to be publick preachers, which ſeems to have been part of the buſineſs of the prophets on the ſabbath days and feſtivals (*b*). It ſhould ſeem, that God generally choſe the prophets, whom he inſpired, out of theſe ſchools. Amos, therefore, ſpeaks of it as an extraordinary caſe, that though he was not one of the ſons of the prophets, but an herdman; "yet the Lord took him as he followed the flock, and ſaid unto him, go propheſy unto my people Iſrael (*c*)." That it was uſual for ſome of theſe ſchools, or at leaſt for their tutors, to be endued with a prophetick ſpirit, appears from the relation in the ſecond book of Kings, of the prophecies concerning the aſcent of Elijah, delivered to Eliſha by the ſons of the prophets both at Jericho and at Bethel (*d*). The houſes, in which they lived, were generally mean, and of their own building (*e*). Their food was chiefly pottage of herbs (*f*), unleſs when the people ſent them ſome better proviſion, as bread, parched corn, honey, dried fruits and the like (*g*). Their dreſs was plain and coarſe, tied about with a leathern girdle (*h*). Riches were no temptation to them; therefore Eliſha not only refuſed Naaman's preſents, but puniſhed his ſervant Gehazi very ſeverely for clandeſtinely obtaining a ſmall ſhare of them (*i*). This recluſe and abſtemious way of life, together with the meanneſs of their attire,

(*a*) See 1 Sam. x. 5. and xix. 20. (*b*) 2 Kings iv. 23. (*c*) Amos vii. 14, 15. (*d*) 2 Kings ii. 3, 5. (*e*) 2 Kings vi. 2,—4. (*f*) 2 Kings iv. 38, 39. (*g*) 1 Kings xiv. 3. 2 Kings iv. 42. (*h*) Zech. xiii. 4. 2 Kings i. 8. (*i*) 2 Kings v. 15, &c.

tire, gave them ſo ſtrange an air, eſpecially among the courtiers, that they looked upon them as no better then mad men (*a*). It was, perhaps, the uncouth dreſs and appearance of the prophet Eliſha, which made the children at Bethel follow and mock him (*b*). The freedom, which the prophets uſed in reproving even princes for their evil deeds, frequently expoſed them to perſecution, impriſonment and ſometimes to death, under the reigns of wicked kings, ſuch as Ahab and Manaſſeh. Nevertheleſs in the main they were much reſpected, and treated with great reverence and regard, by the better and wiſer ſort of people, even thoſe of the higheſt rank (*c*). This is all we certainly know of the prophets, and their ſchools *. As for the account which ſome have ventured to give, of their living in perpetual celibacy, poverty and the like, in the manner of the monks and friars among the papiſts, it is mere fancy and imagination; it being certain, that ſeveral of the prophets were married, and had children, particularly Samuel, Ezekiel, and Iſaiah, whoſe wife is called a propheteſs (*d*). And it was the widow of one of the ſons of the prophets, whoſe oil Eliſha miraculouſly multiplied (*e*). Huldah the propheteſs dwelt in Jeruſalem in the college (*f*), probably in the college of the ſons of the prophets, her huſband Shallum being it is likely one of the number. So much for the prophets.

Next

(*a*) 2 Kings ix. 11. (*b*) 2 Kings ii. 23.
(*c*) 1 Kings xviii. 7. 2 Kings i. 13. and xiii. 14.
* Vid. Vitring de ſynag. vet. lib. 1. part. 2. cap. 6, 7.
(*d*) Iſa. viii. 3. (*e*) 2 Kings iv. 1. (*f*) 2 Kings xxii. 14.

Next to the prophets Godwin ſpeaks of the wiſe men, חכמים chachamim, from חכם chacham, ſapuit; a title applied in general to ſuch as were ſkilful in the law, and who taught and explained it to others. Dr Lightfoot, from the rabbies, ſpeaks of a certain officer in the ſanhedrim, who was called the חכם chacham, κατ' ἐξοχήν. But in what his dignity and office conſiſted, is very uncertain *. What the wiſe men were in the ſcripture ſenſe of that appellation, appears from hence, that thoſe who in the twenty-third of St. Matthew are called σοφοι (a), in the parallel place in St. Luke are ſtiled ἀποστολοι (b), not meaning in particular thoſe twelve diſciples of Chriſt, who were ordained to be witneſſes of his reſurrection, and the firſt preachers of his goſpel; for the apoſtles or wiſe men here ſpoken of, were ſuch as in former ages had been killed by the Jews (c); and they are called ἀποστολοι, from ἀποστελλω, mitto, only as being ſent from God. As it is afterwards expreſſed, "O Jeruſalem, Jeruſalem, thou that killeſt the prophets, and ſtoneſt, τους ἀπεσταλμενους προς αυτην," perſons whom God hath ſent (d)." The difference betwixt prophets and wiſe men, in thoſe paſſages, is probably, that the former ſpoke, ſometimes at leaſt, by inſpiration, and occaſionally predicted things to come; the latter were uninſpired preachers, well ſkilled in the ſcriptures, and ſent of God by a providential miſſion, as ordinary miniſters now are.

In the firſt epiſtle to the Corinthians the Apoſtle ſeems to ſpeak of certain wiſe men with

* See Horæ hebraic. in Luc. x. 25.

(a) Matt. xxiii. 34. (b) Luke xi. 49. (c) Matt. xxiii. 35. (d) ver. 37.

ſome degree of contempt: "Where is the wiſe? where is the ſcribe? where is the diſputer of this world? Hath not God made fooliſh the wiſdom of this world (*a*)?" But perhaps he here refers, not to the jewiſh חכמים Chachamim, but to the Gentile philoſopers, who, as Godwin obſerves, affected to be called σοφοι, till Pythagoras introduced the more modeſt title φιλοσοφοι. There is no great reaſon to doubt, that this was his meaning, becauſe the wiſdom of the wiſe (*b*), of which he ſpoke juſt before, ſignifies the wiſdom of the heathen world, by which, as he afterwards declares, they knew not God (*c*); which was true, not of the Jews, but only of the Gentiles; and theſe Grecian σοφοι were the perſons, to whom the preaching of Chriſt crucified was fooliſhneſs (*d*). Again, when the ſame apoſtle ſays, that he is a debtor σοφοις τε και ανοητοις (*e*), he means the learned and unlearned, to the philoſophers and common people.

It is further obſerved, that the title חכם chacham, with the Jews, and σοφος with the Gentiles, were given to ſuch as were ſkilful in manual arts. Homer accounts ſuch to be taught by Minerva, the goddeſs of wiſdom.

Τευτονες ιν παλαμησι δαημονες, οις γα τε πασης
Ευ ειδη σοφιης υποθημοσυνησιν Αθηνης.
Iliad. XV. l. 411.

And to this ſome think the apoſtle alludes, when he compares himſelf to a σοφος Αρχιτεκτων, a wiſe maſter builder (*f*).

Of

(*a*) 1 Cor. i. 20. (*b*) ver. 19. (*c*) ver. 21.
(*d*) ver. 23. (*e*) Rom. i. 14. (*f*) 1 Cor. iii. 10

Of the Scribes.

The Hebrew word ספר ſopher, which we render ſcribe, is derived from the root ספר ſaphar, numeravit; from whence I ſuppoſe comes the engliſh word cypher; or from the noun ספר ſepher, enumeratio or liber, juſt as the latin librarius & libellarius are derived from liber. Accordingly the targum renders ספרי ſophere, by לבלרין labhlarin (*a*); a word, which as well as many others in the chaldee and ſyriac tongues, is evidently of latin original. The ſeptuagint renders ספר ſopher, by γραμματευς, from γραμμα litera.

The ſcribes therefore, according to the etymological meaning of the term, were perſons ſome way employed about books, writings, numbers or accounts, in tranſcribing, reading, explaining, &c. Now according to theſe various employments, there were ſeveral ſorts of ſcribes. However, moſt authors reduce them to two general heads, or claſſes, civil and eccleſiaſtical ſcribes. As the word כהן cohèn, which in general ſignifies an immediate attendant on a king, is applied either to nobles in the courts of earthly princes, or to the prieſts who attended the ſervice of God the king of Iſrael in his temple; ſo is the word ſcribe applied, both to thoſe perſons who were employed about any kind of civil writings or records, and to ſuch as addicted themſelves to ſtudying, tranſcribing and explaining the holy ſcriptures. Of the civil ſcribes there were doubtleſs various

(*a*) Eſt. iii. 12, chap. viii. 9.

ranks and degrees, from the common ſcrivener to the principal ſecretary of ſtate; in which office we find Seraiah in the reign of king David, who is ranked with the chief officers of the kingdom (*a*); Shebna in the reign of Hezekiah (*b*); Shaphan in the reign of Joſiah (*c*); Eliſhama in the reign of Jehoiakim, who is numbered among the princes (*d*). It is probable the next ſcribe in office to the principal ſecretary of ſtate, was the ſecretary of war, called the "principal ſcribe of the hoſt, who muſtered the people of the land (*e*)." It is reaſonably ſuppoſed this is the officer referred to in the following paſſage of Iſaiah, "Where is the ſcribe? where is the receiver? where is he, that counteth the towers (*f*)?" Which both Grotius and Lowth underſtand to be ſpoken in a way of triumph over the king of Aſſyria, whoſe defeat the prophet had juſt before predicted; whereupon the Iſraelites ſhould reflect with pleaſure on the dangers they had eſcaped, and in a triumphant manner enquire, where is now the ſcribe, or muſter maſter of the hoſt, who threatened our deſtruction? where is the receiver, or collector of thoſe oppreſſive taxes, that were impoſed on us by the enemy? and where is he, that counted the towers? meaning it is likely, the chief engineer of the army, or maſter of the artillery and ammunition.

But beſides theſe principal ſcribes or ſecretaries, we read of numbers of a lower order, as of the "families of the ſcribes which dwelt at Jabez (*g*)," and of the ſcribes, as well as the officers

(*a*) 2 Sam. viii. 17.
(*b*) 2 Kings xviii. 18.
(*c*) 2 Kings xxii. 3.
(*d*) Jer. xxxvi. 12.
(*e*) 2 Kings xxv. 19.
(*f*) Iſa. xxxiii. 18.
(*g*) 1 Chron ii. 55.

officers and porters, that were of the tribe of Levi (*a*). It is probable ſome of theſe were under ſecretaries and clerks to the principal ſcribes, like the ſcribes of king Ahaſuerus before mentioned; others of them might be ſcriveners, employed in drawing deeds, contracts, &c. or in writing letters, and any other buſineſs of penmanſhip; like Baruch the ſcribe, who wrote Jeremiah's prophecy from his mouth (*b*), and who had probably been before employed by Jeremiah to draw the deed of the purchaſe of the field, which he bought of his uncle's ſon (*c*). Such ſcribes are referred to in the forty-fifth Pſalm, "My tongue is as the pen of a ready ſcribe (*d*)."

It is not unlikely, that others of theſe inferior ſcribes might be ſchoolmaſters, who, as the jewiſh doctors tell us, were chiefly of the tribe of Simeon; and that Jacob's prophetick curſe upon this tribe, "that they ſhould be divided in Jacob, and ſcattered in Iſrael *," was hereby accompliſhed. However, we have no evidence of this in ſcripture; which gives us another clear account of the fulfillment of that prophecy, firſt, by an inheritance being aſſigned that tribe, upon the original diviſion of the land of Canaan, within the inheritance of the children of Judah (*e*); and afterward when that tribe was increaſed in Hezekiah's time, by their being obliged to ſeek out new ſettlements

(*a*) 2 Chron. xxxiv. 13. (*b*) Jer. xxxvi. 4, and 32.
(*c*) Jer. xxxii. 12,—14. (*d*) Pſal. xlv. 1.

* Gen. xlix. 7. See the Jeruſalem Targum in loc. R. Solomon, as quoted by Chriſtoph. Cartwright, (elect. targumico-rabbin. in loc.) ſaith, Non ſunt tibi pauperes ſcribæ, & pædagogi, niſi ex Simeone, ut eſſent diſperſi.

(*e*) Joſh. xix. 1.

for a part of it at Gedor, and at Mount-Seir (a). We come now to treat,

2dly, Of the eccleſiaſtical ſcribes, who are frequently mentioned in the New Teſtament. According to Lightfoot, theſe were the learned of the nation, who expounded the law, and taught it to the people *; and they are, therefore, ſometimes called νομοδιδασκαλοι, "Doctors of the law;" for thoſe who, in the fifth chapter of St. Luke, are ſtiled phariſees and doctors of the law (b), are ſoon afterwards called phariſees and ſcribes (c). And that the νομικοι, ſo often mentioned in the New Teſtament, and rendered lawyers, were no other than ſcribes, appears from hence, that he, who in the twenty ſecond of St. Matthew (d), is called νομικος, a lawyer, is ſaid in the twelfth of St. Mark to be εις των γραμματεων one of the ſcribes (e). Nevertheleſs, Druſius †, Trigland ‡, Camero §, and ſome others conceive there muſt have been ſome diſtinction betwixt the ſcribes and the lawyers; becauſe when our Saviour had reproached the ſcribes and phariſees with their hypocriſy (f), it is added, that "one of the lawyers anſwered, and ſaid unto him, maſter, thus ſaying thou reproacheſt us alſo." However the elder Spanheim imagines, that this paſſage rather proves the lawyers and the ſcribes to

(a) 1 Chron. iv. 39, & ſeq.

* Horæ Hebr. Luc. x. 25.

(b) Luke v. 17. (c) ver. 21. (d) Matt. xxii. 35. (e) Mark xii. 28.

† Druſius de tribus ſectis Judæor. lib. ii. cap. xiii. edit. Trigland. tom. 1. p. 249.

‡ Triglandii Diatribe de ſectâ Karæor. cap. vi. p. 58, & ſeq.

§ Camer. annot. in Matt. xxii. 35. apud Criticos ſacros.

(f) Luke xi. 44.

to have been the ſame, than the contrary; for he obſerves, that our Saviour having, in his preceding diſcourſe (*a*), only reproached the phariſees, and denounced woes upon them, at length (*b*) joins the ſcribes with them: "Woe unto you ſcribes and phariſees, hypocrites, &c." Immediately upon which the lawyer takes fire, and reſents his reproaching them alſo, them as well as the phariſees. From whence it appears, the lawyers, otherwiſe called ſcribes, were the perſons here intended. Accordingly the Syriak verſion (*c*) renders γραμματεις, ספרא ſophere, ſcribe *.

That ſcribe was a general name or title of all who ſtudied, and were teachers of the law and of religion at the time of writing the targum, appears from its calling the prophets ſeveral times, ſcribes; as in the firſt book of Samuel it is ſaid concerning Saul, that "a company of ſcribes met him; and they ſaw that he was propheſying among the ſcribes:" and they ſaid, "is Saul alſo among the ſcribes (*d*)?" Again in the prophecy of Iſaiah, "The ſcribe that teacheth lies, he is the tail (*e*)."

Scribe then is not the name of a ſect, as Godwin ſeems to imagine, but as Caſaubon † ſhews, of an office; nor is it true what the former ſaith, that the ſcribes cleaving to the written word, more than the phariſees, who adhered to the traditions, were from thence called textmen. He confounds the ſcribes with the Karaites,

(*a*) ver. 39, & ſeq. (*b*) ver. 44. (*c*) Luke xi. 45.

* Vid. Spanhem. Dubia Evangel. part. ii. Dub. xxxviii, xxxix, xl. §. vii. p. 398, 399. edit. Genev. 1658.

(*d*) 1 Sam. x. 10, 11. (*e*) Iſa. ix. 15.

† Caſaubon, Exercitat. in Baron. annal. exerc. 1. appar. viii. p. 52, 53. edit. Genev. 1655.

Karaites, a ſect that adhered to the written ſcriptures and rejected all traditions. The ſcribes for the moſt part were phariſees, the moſt popular and flouriſhing ſect among the Jews, and they are therefore cenſured by our Saviour along with them, for burthening the people with their traditionary precepts (*a*). There is mention indeed in the Acts, of the "ſcribes that were of the phariſees part (*b*)" in the contention between them and the ſadducees, as if they were ſome other ſect, diſtinct from the phariſees, who joined them on this occaſion. But οι γραμματεις τε μερους των Φαρισαιων may be rendered, agreeable to the Syriack verſion, the ſcribes who were of the phariſees party or ſect; and who, being the more learned perſons of the party, undertook to diſpute againſt the ſadducees.

Upon the whole, the ſcribes were the preaching clergy among the Jews, and whilſt the prieſts attended the ſacrifices, they inſtructed the people. It was on account of their ſuppoſed ſkill in the ſcriptures, that, when Herod was anxious to know, where, according to the prophecies, the Meſſiah ſhould be born, he "gathered all the chief prieſts and ſcribes of the people together," to obtain information (*c*).

Joſeph Scaliger endeavours to eſtabliſh a diſtinction betwixt the γραμματεις τε λαε, the ſcribes of the people, as they are here called, and the γραμματεις τε νομε the ſcribes of the law. The former he makes to be a ſort of publick notaries, whoſe employment was in ſecular buſineſs, the latter, preachers and expounders of the

(*a*) Matt. xxiii. 2, 4. (*b*) Acts xxiii 9. (*c*) Matt. ii. 4.

the law *. But beſides that we no where meet, in ſcripture, with the phraſe γραμματεις τε νομε, the ſcribes of the law, it is evident, that the γραμματεις τε λαε, the ſcribes of the people, whom Herod conſulted, were applied to on account of their ſkill in explaining ſcripture propheçies. And they ſeem to have been in conſiderable reputation for their ſkill in this reſpect, which is intimated in the queſtion that the diſciples put to Chriſt, "Why then ſay the ſcribes, that Elias muſt firſt come (a)?" They were probably called ſcribes of the people, becauſe they were their ſtated and ordinary teachers. And their being in virtue of their office publick ſpeakers, is the reaſon, I ſuppoſe, that the officers, שטרים ſhoterim, mentioned in the book of Deuteronomy, who were to ſpeak to the people (b), are in the Samaritan verſion ſtiled סופרים ſopherim, and in the ſeptuagint, γραμματεις, or ſcribes. That they were, generally at leaſt, publick preachers, may be inferred from its being ſaid, that Chriſt "taught as one having authority, and not as the ſcribes (c)." This aſſertion gives occaſion to Dr. Lightfoot to obſerve three heads of difference betwixt the teaching of the ſcribes and that of Chriſt:

1ſt, They taught chiefly the traditions of the fathers; our Saviour the ſound and ſelf-grounded word of God. And when he bad his diſciples call no man father upon earth, he meant it in oppoſition to the vain traditions which the ſcribes

* Scaliger. Elench. Trihæres. cap. xi. p. 404. edit. Trigland.

(a) Matt. xvii. 10. (b) Deut. xx. 5, 9. (c) Mark. i. 22.

ſcribes taught, namely, the traditions of the fathers.

2dly, The teaching of the ſcribes was eſpecially about external, carnal and trivial rites; as that they ſhould waſh their hands before eating, and the like (*a*); whereas Chriſt taught the ſpiritual and weighty doctrines of faith, repentance, renovation, charity, &c.

3dly, The teaching of the ſcribes was litigious: they toiled in intricate and endleſs diſputes, and were therefore probably the preachers to whom the apoſtle refers in the ſixth chapter of the firſt epiſtle to Timothy, whom he deſcribes as conceited and ignorant, doting about queſtions and ſtrife of words, from whence proceed envy, ſtrife, railings, evil ſurmiſings, perverſe diſputings of men of corrupt minds, &c. (*b*). whereas our Saviour's preaching was plain and convincing*.

We have a further intimation, concerning the manner of their teaching in our Saviour's time in the eleventh chapter of St. Luke (*c*), where, inſtead of leading the people into an acquaintance with true religion, they are charged with taking away the key of knowledge, by leading them off from attending to the ſcriptures, by inſiſting ſo much on traditions, and eſpecially by the falſe interpretations of the prophecies relating to the Meſſiah, whereby the people were kept from believing on him now he was actually come.

Camero obſerves, that a key was delivered to each ſcribe, as a badge of his office, when he

(*a*) Matt. xv. 1, 2.
(*b*) 1 Tim. vi. 3,—5.
* Harmony on Mark i. 22.
(*c*) Luke xi. 52.

he firſt entered upon it; to which perhaps our Saviour here alludes *.

Spanheim further remarks †, that what is here charged upon the lawyers, is elſewhere charged upon the ſcribes (*a*): which is a further evidence, that the lawyers and the ſcribes were the ſame. Nevertheleſs he is ready to admit, that the lawyers might be a ſuperior ſort of ſcribes; yet all the ſcribes might not be lawyers.

That there were different ranks and degrees of theſe ſcribes is inferred from the ſixth chapter of the ſecond book of Maccabees (*b*), where Eleazar is ſaid to be τις των πρωτευοντων γραμματεων, "one of the principal ſcribes." Such a one was Gamaliel (*c*). Joſephus alſo ſpeaks of ιερογραμματεις, ſacred ſcribes ‡, who judged of the ſigns which portended the deſtruction of Jeruſalem; they were probably of ſuperior dignity, and as their name ſeems to import, prieſts as well as ſcribes.

However, notwithſtanding the corrupt doctrine and inſtructions which the ſcribes delivered in their publick teaching, they are ſaid to ſit in Moſes's ſeat, and our Saviour charges his diſciples to obſerve and do whatever they bid them do (*d*). By Moſes's ſeat Dr. Lightfoot underſtands the ſeat of judicature, as they were members of the ſanhedrim §; but the advice which Chriſt gives to obſerve and do what they directed

* Camer. in Luc. xi. 52. apud Criticos Sacros.

† Spanhem. ubi ſupra.

(*a*) Matt. xxiii. 13. (*b*) 2 Macc. vi. 18. (*c*) Acts v. 34.

‡ Joſeph. de bell. Judaic. lib. vi. cap. v. §. 3. p. 388, edit. Haverc.

(*d*) Matt. xxiii. 2, 3.

§ Lightfoot. Horæ hebr. in loc.

directed or commanded, or to follow their good inſtructions in oppoſition to their bad example (*a*), evidently refers to their teaching, rather than to their judging. It is therefore a more probable conjecture, that Moſes's ſeat here means the chair or pulpit, out of which the ſcribes, in the ſynagogues, uſed to deliver their diſcourſes ſitting, as the cuſtom then was (*b*); though we read, that in former times Ezra ſtood upon a pulpit of wood, when he read and explained the law to the people (*c*). It was called the chair or ſeat of Moſes, probably becauſe the books of Moſes were read and explained from it. Now as for our Saviour's charging his diſciples to do and obſerve whatſoever theſe corrupt preachers bid them, it muſt certainly be underſtood only ſo far as they ſat in the chair of Moſes, or delivered the dictates of the law; for if he had required of his diſciples an abſolute ſubmiſſion to their dictates, he would in effect have forbid their believing in himſelf, whom the ſcribes rejected.

Though the phariſees are continually joined with the ſcribes, particularly in the paſſage we have been juſt conſidering, where "the ſcribes and the phariſees are ſaid to ſit in Moſes's ſeat;" we have, however, no reaſon to think any of the phariſees were publick preachers by office, except thoſe who were ſcribes. But the true account of this phraſe, ſcribes and phariſees, is, I apprehend, either that it means ſcribes who were phariſees or phariſaical ſcribes, the ſcribes being generally of that ſect; or elſe it might be common for thoſe phariſees, who were not

(*a*) ver. 3; (*b*) Matt. v. 1, 2; (*c*) Nehem. viii. 4.

not ſcribes, to teach the people occaſionally though they were in no eccleſiaſtical office; as other laymen were allowed to do. Thus Chriſt, who was certainly in no eccleſiaſtical office among the Jews, "went about Galilee teaching in their ſynagogues (*a*);" and Paul, with the leave of the ruler, preached in the ſynagogue at Antioch (*b*). But this we ſhall have occaſion to conſider more particularly, when we treat concerning the ſynagogues.

The ſcribes appear to have been men of great power and authority in the ſtate (*c*). For it is predicted of them, and of the chief prieſts, that they ſhould condemn our Saviour to death. But, I do not apprehend, that this was in virtue of their office as ſcribes, but partly by reaſon of their influence as publick preachers, and partly, as many of them were members of the ſanhedrim, which was then the ſupreme court of judicature.

As for the origin of this office, ſome make it to be as ancient as Ezra, who is ſaid to be a ready ſcribe in the law of Moſes (*d*). But his being called a ſcribe, which was a general title given to men of literature, as has been ſhown before, will not prove the office of eccleſiaſtical ſcribes, ſuch as we find in our Saviour's time, to have been of ſo high antiquity. It is moſt likely, that it grew up by degrees, after the ſpirit of prophecy ceaſed from among the Jews; for when they had no prophet to apply to in any doubt about doctrine or worſhip, they fell into diſputes, and ſplit into ſects and parties; which made a ſet of men neceſſary, whoſe proper

(*a*) Matt. iv, 23. (*b*) Acts xiii. 15, 16.
(*c*) Matt. xx. 18. (*d*) Ezra vii. 6.

per buſineſs it ſhould be to apply themſelves to the ſtudy of the law, in order to explain and teach it to the people *.

Of the Maſorites.

Before we diſmiſs the ſcribes, it will be proper to ſay ſomething of the Maſorets, or Maſorites, who were a lower ſort of ſcribes. Their profeſſion was to write out copies of the hebrew ſcriptures; to teach the true reading of them, and criticiſe upon them. Their work is called Maſora, from מסר maſar, tradidit, becauſe, ſay the Jews, when God gave the law to Moſes at mount Sinai, he taught him firſt, the true reading of it, and ſecondly, its true interpretation; and that both theſe were handed down by oral tradition from generation to generation, till at length they were committed to writing †. The former of theſe, namely, the true reading, is the ſubject of the Maſora; the latter, or true interpretation, of the Miſhna and Gemara,

* See on this ſubject, Spanhem. Dubia Evang. part. ii. Dub. xxxviii,—xl. p. 392,—405. Leuſden. Philolog. hebræo-mixt. Diſſert. xxiii.

† Miſhn. tit. Pirke Abhoth, cap. i. & Maimon. in præfat. ad Jad Chazakah: Præcepta, que Moſi tradita ſunt in Sinai, ea omnia data ſunt cum expoſitione ſuâ, juxta illud Exod. xxiv. 12. "Et dabo tibi tabulas lapideas, & legem, & mandatum, &c." legem ſc. ſcriptam; & mandatum, id eſt, expoſitionem ejus. See the paſſage at large in De Voiſin's obſervat. ad Pugionem fidei. p. 9. Elias Levita aſſerts, that the Maſora was handed down in like manner from Moſes, till it was reduced to writing, as he ſaith, by the doctors of the ſchool of Tiberias. Elias Levita in præf. lib. iii. Maſoreth hamaſoreth. See alſo the book Cozri, p. 199. edit. Buxtorf. 1660.

Gemara, which we ſhall give you an account of in another place.

The age when the Maſorites firſt roſe, is ſomewhat doubtful. Archbiſhop Uſher places them before Jerom; Capel, at the end of the fifth century *. Father Morin aſſerts the Maſorites did not appear till the tenth century. Elias Levita, a Jew, who beſtowed twenty years labour on explaining the Maſora, makes the firſt compilers of it to be Jews of the famous ſchool of Tiberias, about five hundred years after Chriſt †; Baſnage ſays, that we ſeek in vain for the time of the Maſorites; ſince they were not a ſociety, nor even a ſucceſſion of men, who applied themſelves to this ſtudy for a certain number of years, and afterwards diſappeared; but the Maſora is the work of a great number of grammarians, who without aſſociating and communicating their notions, compoſed this collection of criticiſms on the hebrew text ‡. However, if, according to Elias Levita, the ſchool of Tiberias firſt gathered them into one volume, and ſo properly begun the work which is now called the Maſora, or which there is both a greater and a leſs printed at Venice and at Baſil; it hath nevertheleſs been enlarged ſince the time of that ſchool; for there were Maſorites long afterwards, even as late as about A. D. 1030; particularly, Ben-Aſher, and Ben-Naphtali, who were very famous

* Capelli Critic. ſacr. lib. vi. cap. iv. p. 391.

† Elias Levita ubi ſupra.

‡ Baſnage in his hiſtory of the Jews, book iii. chap. ix. §. vii. p. 182. mentions the opinions of Uſher and Morin, as well as of Capel and Levita, but endeavours to prove, §. ix. that Ben-Aſher and Ben-Naphtali, about the year 1030, were the true inventors of the Maſora.

mous, and the laſt of the profeſſion. Each of theſe publiſhed a copy of the whole hebrew text, as correct, ſaith Dr. Prideaux, as they could make it. The eaſtern Jews have followed that of Ben-Naphtali, and the weſtern that of Ben-Aſher; and all that has been done ſince, is to copy after them, without making any more corrections, or maſoretical criticiſms *.

Their work regards merely the letter of the hebrew text; in which they have, firſt, fixed the true reading by vowels and accents; though whether theſe points were originally annexed to the hebrew letters by them is a matter of diſpute, which we ſhall conſider in another place.

They have, ſecondly, numbered not only the chapters and ſections, but the verſes, words and letters of the text. They find, accordingly, in the Pentateuch 5245 verſes, and in the whole bible 23206. Some indeed have doubted, whether they carried their diligence ſo far as to number the letters. But father Simon atteſts that he had ſeen a MS. Maſora, which numbered in the book of Geneſis 12 great ſections, 43 ſedarim or orders, 1534 verſes, 20713 words, and 78100 letters †. The Maſora is therefore called by the Jews, the hedge or fence of the law; in as much as this numbering the verſes, words and letters is a means of preſerving it from being altered and corrupted. Thus it is ſaid in the miſhna, that tythes are the fences

* Prideaux's Connect. part. i. book v. vol 2. p. 516. edit. 10.

† Vid. Simon. hiſtr. critic. vet. Teſt. lib. i. cap. xxvi. p. 128. Paris 1681.

fences of riches, vows are the fences of ſanctity, ſilence is the fence of wiſdom, and the Maſora is the fence of the law *. Hence alſo Aben-Ezra calls the Maſorites the keepers of the walls of the holy city †.

They have, thirdly, marked whatever irregularities are found in any of the letters of the hebrew text; as, that in ſome words one letter is of a larger (*a*), in others, of a leſs (*b*), ſize, than the reſt. Of the former ſort they diſcover thirty-one inſtances; of the latter, thirty-three. They obſerve four words in which one letter is ſuſpended, or placed ſomewhat higher than the reſt (*c*); nine places, in which the letter nun is inverted (*d*); and ſeveral places, where the final letters are not uſed at the end of words; and others, where they are uſed in the middle.

They are likewiſe very fruitful in finding out reaſons for theſe irregularities, and myſteries in them. Thus the great Vau in the word גחון gachon, in the forty ſecond verſe of the eleventh chapter of Leviticus, is, to ſignify, that it is juſt the middle of the Pentateuch. The laſt letter both of the firſt and laſt word of this ſentence in the fixth chapter of Deuteronomy (*e*), "Hear, O Iſrael, the Lord thy God is one Lord," is of an extraordinary ſize, in order to denote the extraordinary weight of that ſentence, and the peculiar attention it deſerves. The Caph

* Pirke Abhoth, cap. 3. §. 13. tom. 4. p. 442. edit. Surenhus.

† Aben-Ezra quoted by Carpzovius, Critic. Sacr. part. 1. cap. vi. p. 288. Lipſiæ, 1728.

(*a*) Vid. Deut. vi. 4. (*b*) Vid. Gen. ii. 4.
(*c*) Vid. Judg. xviii. 30. (*d*) Vid. Numb. x. 35.
(*e*) Deut. vi. 4.

in the word לִבְכֹתָהּ libhchothah in the ſecond verſe of the twenty-third chapter of Geneſis, where Abraham is ſaid to weep for Sarah, is of a leſſer ſize, to ſignify the moderation of his mourning, ſhe being an old woman.

They are fourthly, ſuppoſed to be the authors of the Keri and Chethibh, or the marginal corrections of the text in our hebrew bibles; among which they have noted tranſpoſitions of letters in ſome words, as יְבוּחַר jebuchar, for יְחוּבַר jechubar, in the ninth chapter of eccleſiaſtes and the fourth verſe; and one word put for another, as וּבְנֵי ubenè, for וּבֶן uben, in the forty-ſixth chapter of Geneſis and the twenty-third verſe. But we ſhall have occaſion to take further notice of the Keri and Chethibh, when we come to treat of the hebrew language.

From this ſhort ſpecimen of the works of the Maſorites, you will probably conceive a higher opinion of their induſtry and diligence, then of their judgment. As for the irregularities in the letters, upon which they have commented, it being reaſonable to ſuppoſe that theſe happened at firſt by meer accident in tranſcribing, they would have diſcovered more good ſenſe, if they had corrected them, than in deviſing reaſons for them, and aſſigning myſtical interpretations to them.

Dr. Prideaux ſaith, thoſe, who were the authors of the Maſora now extant, were a monſtrous trifling ſet of men, whoſe criticiſms and obſervations went no higher than numbering the verſes, words and letters of every book in the hebrew bible, marking which was the middle word, verſe or letter in each of them, and making of ſuch other poor and low remarks concerning them, as are not worth reading

ing or regarding, whatever Richard Simon the Frenchman may ſay to the contrary *.

The דרשנים durſhanim, whom Godwin ſuppoſes to be intended by the diſputers of this world mentioned in the firſt chapter of the firſt epiſtle to the Corinthians (*a*), were likewiſe a ſort of ſcribes or doctors of the law. There was a threefold expoſition of the law in vogue among the Jews, in their later and corrupt ages; the firſt, a literal explication of the written law, which they called מקרא mikra, the ſecond, conſiſting of the tradition of the fathers, ſtiled the משנה miſhna, with a comment upon them ſtiled the גמרא gemara, both together called the talmud; the third, a myſtic and allegorical expoſition of the ſcriptures, called מדרש midraſh, or commentary κατ' ἐξοχήν †. The apoſtle's allegory of Sara and Hagar with their ſons by which he illuſtrates the two covenants, in the epiſtle to the Galatians (*b*), is ſomewhat in this ſtile, and was therefore admirably ſuited to the taſte of the perſons, whom he is there addreſſing.

The cabaliſts likewiſe were a ſort of myſtical doctors, who diſcovered a world of myſtery in the letters of the ſacred text, either by conſidering their numeral power, or by changing and tranſpoſing them, in different ways according to the rules of their art. By theſe means they extracted ſenſes from the ſacred oracles,

* See Prideaux's connect. part. i. book v. ſub anno 446. For a larger account of the Maſorites and their works, conſult, beſides the author's already quoted, Buxtorfii Tiberias, Carpzovii Critica ſacra, part i. cap. vi. and Walton. prolegom. viii. ad Bibl. Polyglot.

(*a*) 1 Cor. i. 20.

† Vid. Lightfoot. Hor. hebraic. in Luc. x. 25.

(*b*) Gal. iv.

very different from those which the expression seemed naturally to import, or which were ever intended by the authors *.

We have before offered some reasons for believing that by the σοφοι, mentioned in the first chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians (a), are meant gentile philosophers, and not, as Godwin seems to imagine, jewish teachers of traditions. Whether the disputer of this world, συζητητης του αιωνος τουτου, refered to the jewish allegorical doctors, or the gentile natural philosophers, as distinguished from the moral philosophers, called κοσμικοι, is differently conjectured by the learned, but very hard to be determined with certainty.

* A large account of the cabalistic art, as practised not only by Jews, but by Heathens and Christians, may be seen in Basnage's history of the Jews, book iii. chap. x, p. xxviii.

(a) 1 Cor. i. 20.

CHAP. VII.

Of the title RABBI.

THE title rabbi, with several others from the same root רבב rabhabh, magnus est, vel, multiplicatus est, began first to be assumed, according to Godwin, as a distinguishing title of honour by men of learning, about the time of the birth of Christ. We find it anciently given, indeed, to several magistrates and officers of state. In the book of Esther it is said, the king appointed כל־עבדיו וכל־רבתו col abdeiv vecol rab betho, which we render "all the officers of his house (a)." In Jeremiah we read of the רבי רבי המלך rabbè hammelok, "the princes of the king (b)." In the book of Job it is said that the רבים rabbim, which we render "great men, are not always wise (c)," a rendering, which I apprehend, well expresses the original meaning of the word. It was not therefore in those days properly a title of honour, belonging to any particular office or dignity in church or state; but all, who were of superior rank and condition in life, were called רבים rabbim. We do not find the prophets, or other

(a) Esth. i. 8. (b) Jer. xli. 1. (c) Job xxxii. 9. eng. 10. heb.

men of learning in the Old Teſtament, affecting any title beſide that which denoted their office; and they were contented to be addreſſed by their bare names. But as religion and true knowledge declined among them, their pride diſcovered itſelf in affectation of titles of honour. Thus in the firſt ages of the chriſtian church, during the prevalence of truth, and of piety and humility, the miniſters of Chriſt had no other titles, but the mere names of their office, apoſtles, paſtors, &c. whereas in the later, corrupt ages of ignorance and pride a number of titles of honour were invented, to ſupport their dignity, and conciliate the reſpect and reverence of the people; as maſters, doctors, &c.

The firſt jewiſh rabbi, ſaid to have been diſtinguiſhed with any title of honour, was Simeon, the ſon of Hillel, who ſucceeded his father as preſident of the Sanhedrim; and his title was that of Rabban *. He is ſuppoſed by Altingius to have been the Simeon, who took the infant Jeſus in his arms, and bleſſed him (a); and for this reaſon, as he conceives, he is ſeldom mentioned by the later rabbies, though he was a man of ſuch honour and dignity, and the firſt who was diſtinguiſhed by their favourite title †. Others think it hardly probable, that the Simeon, who was directed by the Holy Ghoſt to pay that reſpect to our Saviour, was the preſident of the Sanhedrim; for Gamaliel, the preſident's Son was tutor to St. Paul, who received no favourable notion of chriſtianity from him, as in all probability he muſt have done from the ſon of that Simeon who took our Saviour

* Lightfoot's Harmony on Luke ii. 25.

(a) Luke ii. 25. † Alting. de Schilo, lib. iv. 21. tom. v. oper. p. 99. Lightfoot ubi ſupra, and Horæ hebr, Luke ii. 25.

viour in his arms and bleſſed him. Beſides, had he, who did this, been preſident of the great council, St. Luke, in all likelihood would have taken notice of ſo extraordinary a circumſtance, inſtead of mentioning him only as "a certain man in Jeruſalem, whoſe name was Simeon *."

The later rabbies tell us, this title was conferred with a good deal of ceremony. When a perſon had gone through the ſchools, and was though worthy of the degree of rabbi, he was firſt placed in a chair ſomewhat raiſed above the company; then were delivered to him a key and a table-book; the key, as a ſymbol of the power or authority now conferred upon him, to teach that knowledge to others, which he had learned himſelf. And this key he afterwards wore as a badge of his honour; and when he died, it was buried with him. The table-book was a ſymbol of his diligence in his ſtudies, and of his endeavouring to make further improvements in learning.

The third ceremony in the creation of a rabbi, was the impoſition of hands on him by the delegates of the Sanhedrim, practiſed in imitation of Moſes's † ordaining Joſhua by this rite, to ſucceed him in his office (*a*). And then

Fourthly, they proclaimed his title ‡.

According to Maimonides, the third ceremony was not looked upon to be eſſential; but was ſometimes omitted. They did not always, ſaith he, lay their hands on the head of the elder

* See Witſii Miſcell. tom. i. lib. 1. cap. xxi. §. xiii,—xvi. p. 289,—292. edit. Traject. 1692.

† Maimon. tractat. Sanhedrin, cap. 4. Vid. Selden de Synedr. lib. i. cap. xiv. oper. vol. 1. tom. 2. p. 1088, 1089. (*a*) Numb. xxvii. 18. Deut. xxxiv. 9.

‡ See on the creation of a rabbi Alting. in oratione de promot. hebr.

elder to be ordained; but called him rabbi, and ſaid, Behold thou art ordained, and haſt power, &c.*.

We find this title given to John the baptiſt (a); and frequently to our bleſſed Saviour; as by John's diſciples (b), by Nicodemus (c), and by the people that followed him (d).

It has been made a queſtion, whether our Lord had taken the degree and title of rabbi in the jewiſh ſchools. Vitringa maintains the affirmative †, alledging, that he was called ſo by Judas (e), who he ſuppoſes would not have complemented him with a title, to which he had no right. It may be replied, that this being before Judas diſcovered his treaſon and while he aſſociated with the diſciples, he no doubt affected to ſpeak as reſpectfully to Chriſt, as any of the reſt.

Vitringa inſiſts upon another argument, to prove that Chriſt muſt have taken the degree of rabbi; alledging, that otherwiſe he could not have preached publickly in the temple and in the ſynagogues, as we know he did. But this is built on a miſtake in fact. Any Iſraelite might preach publickly in the temple, or in the ſynagogue by the permiſſion of the ruler of it, as we obſerved in a former lecture ‡.

Mr. Selden takes the other ſide of the queſtion §, denying, that Chriſt had ever taken this degree. And for this opinion ſeveral arguments may be alledged. 1ſt,

* Maimon. Sanhedr. cap. 4. See Selden ubi ſupra, and Lightfoot's Hor. hebr. Acts xiii. 3.

(a) John iii. 26. (b) John i. 38. (c) John iii. 2. (d) John vi. 25.

† Vitring. de ſynag. vetere, vol. 2. lib. 3. part 1. cap. 7. p. 706, 707. (e) Matt. xxvi. 25. ‡ See above, p. 399. § Selden de Synedr. Hebræor. lib. ii. cap. vii. § viii. oper. vol. 1. tom. 2. p. 1373.

aſt, It appears, that he had had no education in the rabbinical ſchools, as thoſe who were honoured with this degree muſt have had (a).

2dly, He expreſſes his diſapprobation of the title, and charges his diſciples not to aſſume it (b): "Be not ye called rabbi, &c." Which as Mr. Selden ſhews, was a prohibition of their taking that degree; but was not intended abſolutely to condemn the uſe of the title as a mark of civility, to thoſe publick teachers, who might not in form have taken the degree; a practice, at that time, common among the Jews, as giving the title of doctor to the miniſter of the pariſh, whether he hath taken the degree or not, is now among us †.

The reaſon of our Lord's forbidding his diſciples to be called, or to aſſume the title of rabbi, was doubtleſs,

1ſt, To caution them againſt that pride and haughtineſs which generally went along with it. For, though the rabbies pretended to ſlight the honour, and it was a maxim with them, "Love the work and not the title ‡," it is certain nevertheleſs, they were exceſſively proud and vain of it, inſomuch that they were highly offended, if any perſon ſpoke to them without giving it to them; a remarkable inſtance of which Wagenſeil relates ‡: "A certain rabbi ſent a letter to another, and forgot to give him his

(a) John vii. 15. (b) Matt. xxiii. 7, 8.

† Selden de Synedr. lib. ii. cap. vii. §. x. oper. vol. 1. tom. 2. p. 1378.—1383.

‡ See Maimonides, as quoted by Lightfoot, Hor. hebraic. Matt. xxiii. 7. and Pirke abboth, lib. 1. cap. 16. et Ob. de Bartenora in loc.

‡ Wagenſeil in Sota, Annot. 5. in cap. i. §. x. exeept. Gemaræ. p. 109.

his title; but only called him in plain terms, friend. At which he was ſo highly incenſed, that he immediately ſent a meſſenger to that rabbi, charging him to call him Anan, Anan, (which was his name,) without giving him the title rabbi." This it ſeems, was the keeneſt revenge he could take on him for ſo groſs an affront. And Dr. Lightfoot tells us, from one of their rabbinical books, that the Sanhedrim excommunicated certain perſons twenty-four times for not giving due honour to the rabbies *.

2dly, the deſign of our Saviour's forbidding his diſciples to be called rabbi, was probably alſo, that they might not take upon them to lord it over the faith and conſciences of men, as the rabbies did, who pretended to little leſs than to be infallible guides of faith and conſcience; inſomuch that it was looked upon as a crime for any perſon not to hearken to the rabbies, or to diſbelieve or doubt of the truth of what they taught. Hence Gamaliel adviſes the ignorant among the Jews "to get themſelves rabbies, that they may no longer doubt of any thing †;" and rabbi Eleazar ſays, "he that ſeparates from the ſchool of the rabbies, or teaches any thing which he has not heard from his maſter, provokes the divine Majeſty to depart from Iſrael ‡."

Maimonides tell us, that men of the degree of rabbi were alſo called Abba, or father; and that "he, who will be holy, muſt perform the words

* Hora hebraic. Matt. xxiii. 7. † Pirke Abhoth, cap. 1. § 16. which precept Maimonides and Bartenora (in loc.) reſtrain to ritual obſervances.

‡ Talmud Babylon. tit. Berachoth, fol. 23, 2. See Lightfoot, Horæ hebr. Matt. xxiii. 7.

words of the fathers *." Hence our Saviour forbids his diſciples taking the title of father as well as rabbi (*a*).

Theſe are the teachers and guides to whom the poſtle ſeems to refer, when he ſaith, (*b*) "Behold thou art called a Jew, and reſteſt in the law, and makeſt thy boaſt of God, and knoweſt his will, and approveſt the things that are more excellent, being inſtructed out of the law, and art confident that thou thyſelf art a guide of the blind, a light of them which are in darkneſs, an inſtructor of the fooliſh, a teacher of babes which haſt the form of knowledge, and of truth in the law †."

The reaſon of our Saviour's prohibiting his diſciples to be called rabbi is expreſſed in theſe words, "Be not ye called rabbi, for one is your maſter, even Chriſt," καθηγητης, your guide and conductor, on whoſe word and inſtructions alone you are to depend in matters of religion and ſalvation. Accordingly the inſpired apoſtles pretend to nothing more than, as the ambaſſadors of Chriſt, to deliver his inſtructions; and for their own part, they expreſsly diſclaim all dominion over the faith and conſciences of men (*c*).

The jewiſh writers diſtinguiſh betwixt the titles Rab, Rabbi and Rabban. As for Rab and Rabbi, the only difference betwixt them is, that Rab was the title of ſuch as had had their education, and taken their degree, in ſome foreign jewiſh ſchool; ſuppoſe at Babylon, where there was

* Maimon in Præfat. Tractat. Pirke Abhoth, Miſhn. tom. 4. p. 393.

(*a*) Matt. xxiii. 8, 9. (*b*) Rom. ii. 17,—20.

† See Whitby on Matt. xxiii. 8, 9.

(*c*) See 2 Cor. v. 20. chap. i. 24.

was a ſchool or academy of conſiderable note: Rabbi was the title of ſuch as were educated in the land of Judea, who were accounted more honourable than the others *. But as for Rabbon, it was the higheſt title; which, they ſay, was never conferred on more then ſeven perſons, namely, on R. Simeon, five of his deſcendents, and on R. Jochanan, who was of a different family †. It was on this account, it ſhould ſeem, that the blind man gave this title to Chriſt (*a*); being convinced that he was poſſeſſed of divine power, and worthy of the moſt honourable diſtinctions. And Mary Magdalene, when ſhe ſaw Chriſt after his reſurrection, "ſaid unto him Rabboni (*b*)," that is, my Rabban, like my lord in engliſh; for rabbon is the ſame with rabban, only pronounced according to the Syriac dialect.

* Elias Levita in Tiſhbhi, voce רב.
† See Lightfoot's Harmony on Luke ii. 25.
(*a*) Mark x. 51. (*b*) John xx. 16.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Nazarites and Rechabites.

GODWIN makes a threefold diſtinction of Nazarites, which we ſhall find to be merely a diſtinctio nominis, as the logicians expreſs themſelves, and not a diviſio generis in ſpecies.

The firſt ſort, called Nazarites from נזר nazar, ſeparavit, are mentioned ſeveral times in the Old and New Teſtament; the ſecond, whoſe name is derived from the city Nazareth, are occaſionally mentioned in the New; for the third, who rejected the five books of Moſes, and were therefore termed Nazarites, according to Godwin, from נשר naſa, diſſecuit, becauſe they cut off or excluded theſe books from the canon of ſcripture; finding no mention of them either in the Old Teſtament, or in the New, I think they deſerve no further notice: It is chiefly the firſt ſort, that we are now to conſider.

The firſt perſon, to whom the title נזיר nazèr, is applied is Joſeph, who in the forty-ninth chapter of Geneſis is ſaid to be נזיר אחיו nezir

nezir echaiv, which we render "ſeparated from his brethren (*a*);" but the vulgate, "Nazaræi inter fratres ſuos." Moſes gives him the ſame title in the bleſſing which he pronounced on his poſterity in the book of Deuteronomy: "Let the bleſſing come upon the head of Joſeph, and upon the top of the head of him that was ſeparated from his brethren (*b*);" נזיר אחיו nezir echaiv. He is called נזיר nazir, not becauſe he was of any particular ſect, or ſuch a Nazarite, as thoſe concerning whom we are diſcourſing; but for one or other of the following reaſons; either becauſe he was ſeparated from the ſociety of his brethren by their malice towards him, or from their evil practices and examples by the grace of God, or was advanced by providence ſo high above them in dignity and honour. The ſeptuagint eſpouſes the laſt mentioned reaſon, reading נזיר אחיו nezir echaiv, in Geneſis, επι κεφαλης ων ηγησατο αδελφων, ſuper caput fratrum, quorum dux fuit; and in Deuteronomy, επι κεφαλης δεδοξασμενος επ' αδελφοις, ſuper verticem glorificatus in fratribus. Hence the word נזר nezer is ſometimes uſed for a royal or ſacerdotal crown or diadem: "Thou haſt profaned his (the king's) crown, נזר nezer, by caſting it to the ground (*c*)." Again, "They made the plate of the holy crown (of the high-prieſt) of pure gold (*d*)."

But whatever was the reaſon of Joſeph's being called נזר nazir, the word came afterwards to denote a particular ſort of ſeparation and devotedneſs to God; and on that account was applied to the Nazarites: Who were accordingly

(*a*) Gen xlix. 26. (*b*) Deut. xxxiii. 16. (*c*) Pſal. lxxxix. 39. (*d*) Exod. xxxix. 30.

ingly of two ſorts, ſuch as were by their parents devoted to God in their infancy, or even ſometimes before they were born, and ſuch as devoted themſelves. The former are called Nazaræi nativi, and were Nazarites for life; the latter Nazaræi votivi, who ordinarily bound themſelves to obſerve the laws of the Nazarites only for a limited time.

In the number of the Nazaræi nativi, or perpetual Nazarites, were Sampſon (*a*), Samuel (*b*), and John the baptiſt (*c*). All that we can diſcover in their way of life, which was peculiar, was, that they were to abſtain from wine and intoxicating liquors, and were not to ſhave their heads, but let their hair grow to its full length. It is true, neither Samuel nor John the baptiſt are expreſsly called Nazarites, as Sampſon is. Nevertheleſs as one law of the Nazarites is mentioned to which Samuel was obliged, namely, that no razor ſhould come upon his head; and another to which the baptiſt was obliged, that he ſhould drink neither wine nor ſtrong drink; it is reaſonably preſumed they were both under obligation to obſerve all the laws of the perpetual Nazarites.

The rabbies inſiſt, that Abſalom was a perpetual Nazarite, becauſe he wore his hair ſo long that when he polled it, it weighed two hundred ſhekels (*d*). But as this circumſtance is mentioned immediately after the account of the beauty of his perſon (*e*), it leads one to conclude, that he wore his hair ſo long, rather for ornament than on any religious account. Beſides, his polling it at the end of the year is an

(*a*) Judg. xiii. 5. (*b*) 1 Sam. i. 11. (*c*) Luke i. 15. (*d*) 2 Sam. xiv. 26. (*e*) ver. 25.

evidence againſt his being a perpetual Nazarite. The rabbies indeed, have framed a rule for the perpetual Nazarites, on purpoſe not to exclude Abſalom; affirming, that when their hair grew very heavy and troubleſome, they were allowed to cut it to the length in which it was ordinarily worn by other people, but not to ſhave it it quite off; and this, they ſay, was the reaſon of Abſalom's polling his head every year, becauſe his hair grew ſo exceeding heavy, that what he cut off weighed "two hundred ſhekels after the king's weight *."

We ſhall not ſtay to diſpute this point with the rabbies, becauſe it is of no great conſequence. But the amazing weight of Abſalom's hair demands our particular attention. Dr. Cumberland, in his eſſay on Jewiſh weights and meaſures, ſhews, that a Jewiſh ſhekel of ſilver was equal to half an ounce avoirdupoize. Conſequently two hundred ſhekels is ſix pounds and a quarter; an incredible weight for the hair of one man's head!

Various are the conjectures of the learned in order to remove this difficulty. Some ſuppoſe the ſhekel, here ſpoken of, was leſs than the common ſhekel; and they obſerve his hair is ſaid to weigh "two hundred ſhekels after the king's weight," not according to the common ſhekel of the ſanctuary. Now ſhould we ſuppoſe the ſhekel here meant to be a weight in gold equal to the value of the ſilver ſhekel, or half ounce, that would reduce the weight of the hair to about five ounces.

Others

* Vid. R. de Bartenor. & Maimon. comment. in Miſhn. tit. Nazir, cap. 1. §. 2. tom. 3. p. 148. edit. Surenhus.

Others imagine there has been an error in tranſcribing the hebrew copy; that the number of ſhekels being expreſſed by the numeral letter כ caph, which ſtands for twenty, the tranſcriber miſtook it for ר reſh, which ſtands for two hundred; a miſtake, which might eaſily be made, if the lower part of the caph was not very plain.

Others, again, are of opinion, that the two hundred ſhekels denote not the weight, but the value, of the hair; the jewiſh women having been uſed to purchaſe it to adorn themſelves. It cannot, indeed, be eaſily ſuppoſed, that the king's ſon ſold his hair. But the verb שקל ſhakal, rendered "he weighed," may be taken imperſonally *, to ſignify, it was weighed at the rate of two hundred ſhekels, perhaps by the barber, whoſe perquiſite it might be.

Where we cannot arrive at certainty we muſt be content with probability; and I apprehend either of theſe conjectures is ſufficiently probable to relieve the difficulty in the text.

We return to the Nazarites; I have only further to obſerve concerning the Nazaræi nativi, that they were not bound to the ſame ſtrictneſs as the votivi, who muſt not touch any dead carcaſe, nor ſo much as enter the doors of a houſe where a deceaſed perſon was. Sampſon, who was a Nazaræus nativus, made no ſcruple of taking honey out of the carcaſe of a lion (*a*); and Samuel hewed Agag in pieces (*b*).

As for the Nazaræi votivi, who bound themſelves by a vow to obſerve the law of the Na-

* See many inſtances of this ſort produced by Glaſſius, Philolog. ſacra, lib iii. Tract. iii. de Verbo, Canon xxiii. p. 380, 381. edit. Amſtel. 1711.

(*a*) Judg. xiv. 8, 9. (*b*) 1 Sam. xv. 33.

zarites for a certain time, ſuppoſe a month, (the rabbies ſay, it could not be for a leſs time, though it might be for a longer *,) their laws, which are contained in the ſixth chapter of the book of Numbers, are theſe:

1ſt, That they ſhould abſtain from wine, and from all inebriating liquors, and even from eating grapes, during the time of their ſeparation (*a*).

2dly, That they ſhould let their hair grow without cutting is till the days of their vow were fulfilled (*b*); and then they were to have their hair ſhaved off at the door of the tabernacle, and burnt under the altar (*c*). It was probably from this cuſtom of the jewiſh Nazarites, that the Gentiles learnt the practice of conſecrating their hair to their gods †, of which Suetonius relates an inſtance in his life of Nero; informing us, that he cut off his firſt beard, and put it into a golden box ſet with jewels, and conſecrated it to Jupiter Capitolinus ‡.

When a Nazaræus votivus was polluted by touching any dead body, he was to "ſhave his head on the ſeventh day," that is, at the end of the time, during which he was unclean, and "on the eighth day to offer a ſin-offering and a burnt-offering" for his purification; and then to "conſecrate unto the Lord the days of his ſeparation," bringing a "lamb of the firſt year for a treſpaſs-offering;" that is, he was to begin again the accompliſhment of his vow, "the days

* Miſhn. tit Nazir, cap. 1. §. 3. p. 148. tom. 3. edit. Surenhus.

(*a*) Numb. vi. 3, 4. (*b*) ver. 5. (*c*) ver. 18.

† Lucian repreſents this as a very common cuſtom, with which he himſelf had complied, de Syriâ Dea, ſub fin.

‡ Sueton. in vit. Neronis, cap. xii. 11. p. 176, 177. tom. 2. edit. Pitiſci, Traject. ad Rhen. 1690.

days which were before having been loſt, becauſe his ſeparation was defiled (*a*)." The Nazarite's ſhaving his head in caſe of pollution is not ordered to be done, as in caſe of the accompliſhment of his vow, at the temple; but might be done any where, it ſeems, in the country, provided it was not ſo far diſtant as to prevent his offering the accuſtomed ſacrifices at the temple the next day. However, ſome learned men have thought, that thoſe, who were at a great diſtance or in foreign countries, might have their head ſhaved in the place where they were, and offer the appointed ſacrifice at the temple the next opportunity, whether on account of accidental pollution, or at the accompliſhment of their vow *. Thus, they ſay, Paul (according to others Aquila †) did (*b*), who made his vow at Corinth, ſhaved his head at Cenchrea, and went ſoon afterward to Jeruſalem to accompliſh it by the uſual offering ‡.

3dly, A Nazarite muſt not come near any dead body, while the vow was upon him (*c*).

It is to be obſerved, that women as well as men might bind themſelves by this vow.

(*a*) Numb. vi. 9,—12.

* Steph. Morin. Diſſert. viii. p. 103. Grotius in Acts xviii. 18. Ancient univerſal hiſtory, in the hiſtory of the Jews, book i. chap. vii.

† Witſii Meletem. de vitâ Pauli, Sect. vii. §. xiii. p. 100. & xv. ad fin. p. 102. Grotius in loc.

(*b*) Acts xviii. 18.

‡ Concerning St. Paul's vow ſee Doddridge in loc. Lardner's Credibi. vol. 1. book 1. chap. 9. §. 7. Benſon's hiſtory of planting the chriſtian religion, vol. 2. chap. 5. §. 13. & chap. 8. §. 11. Hammond in loc. Wolfii Curæ philolog. in loc. and Meinhard de Pauli Naſiræatu, apud Theſaur. philolog. theolog. tom. 2. p. 473. eſpecially cap. iv. Amſtel. 1702.

(*c*) Numb. vi. 6.

"When either man or woman ſhall ſeparate themſelves to vow a vow of a Nazarite," then they ſhall do ſo and ſo (*a*). This the mother of Sampſon is adviſed by the angel to do, at leaſt to ſubmit to the rule of the Nazarites during the time of her geſtation (*b*).

The inſtitution of Nazaritiſm was no doubt partly religious, and it might alſo be partly civil and prudential.

That it was partly religious, is concluded from the following paſſage of the prophet Amos, in which, among other extraordinary favours and bleſſings which God had vouchſafed to the Iſraelites, he tells them, "I raiſed up of your ſons for prophets, and of your young men for Nazarites (*c*);" that is, I inſpired them with a more than ordinary ſpirit of devotion and piety, and induced them to take the Nazarite's vow, by which they were bound to the ſtricteſt ſanctity, to give themſelves to reading, meditation and prayer; and, in token of their moral purity, carefully to avoid all legal pollution, and in ſign of their ſpiritual mortification, and as having their minds ſo taken up with divine contemplation as to be negligent of external ornaments, they were to let their hair grow without trimming. Moreover they were to abſtain from wine and all inebriating liquors during the days of their ſeparation; juſt as the prieſts were forbidden to drink wine during their attendance on their miniſtry, "leſt they forget the law," and their minds ſhould be diſcompoſed for the exerciſes of devotion.

The interdiction laid on the Nazarites, was more ſtrict and ſevere than that laid upon the prieſts.

(*a*) Numb. vi. 2. (*b*) Judg. xiii. 7. (*c*) Amos ii. 11.

priests. The former were forbidden the total use of the vine; they might neither taste "any liquor made of grapes, whether wine or vinegar, nor eat moist grapes nor dried, neither any thing that came of the vine-tree, from the kernel even to the husk (*a*)." Which occasions Dr. Lightfoot's making the two following queries:

1st, Whether the vine-tree might not be the tree in paradise, which was forbidden to Adam, and by tasting the fruit of which he sinned and fell. The jewish doctors, he saith, positively asserted this without the least hesitation.

2dly, Whether the law about the Nazarites had not some reference to Adam, while under that prohibition in his state of innocence? If the bodily and legal uncleannesses, concerning which there are precepts so very strict in the thirteenth chapter of Leviticus; if the leprosy especially, the greatest of all uncleannesses, properly betokened the state and nature of sin, might not the laws concerning Nazarites, which injoined the strictest purity in the most pure religion, insomuch that Nazarites are said to be "purer then snow and whiter than milk (*b*)," be designed in commemoration of the state of innocence before the fall *?

But beside the religious, there might also be a civil and prudential use of this institution, the sobriety and temperance which the Nazarites were bound to observe, being very conducive to health. Accordingly they are celebrated for their fair and ruddy complexion, being said to be both whiter than milk and more ruddy in

(*a*) Numb. vi. 3, 4. (*b*) Lam. iv. 7.
* Lightfoot, Horæ hebr. in Luc. i. 15.

body than rubies (*a*): the ſure ſigns of a ſound and healthy conſtitution. It may here be obſerved, that when God intended to raiſe up Sampſon, by his ſtrength of body to ſcourge the enemies of Iſrael, he ordered, that from his infancy he ſhould drink no wine, but live by the rule of the Nazarites, becauſe that would greatly contribute to make him ſtrong and healthy; intending, after nature had done its utmoſt to form this extraordinary inſtrument of his providence, to ſupply its defect by his own ſupernatural power *.

Godwin mentions a ſecond ſort of Nazarites, who were ſo termed from נצר natſar, from whence came Natſareth or Nazareth, the name of a town in Galilee where Chriſt was conceived and brought up. Hence our Saviour was himſelf called a Nazarene, or Nazarite (*b*); for this name or title, as applied to Chriſt, is ſometimes wrote Ναζαρηνος (*c*), ſometimes Ναζωραιος (*d*), which words ſeem to be uſed by the evangeliſts in preciſely the ſame ſenſe; accordingly the Syriac verſion renders both by the word Notzrio.

The evangeliſt Matthew, aſſigning as the reaſon for our Saviour's being called Ναζαραιος, that he came and dwelt in the city of Nazareth (*e*), and referring to ſome prophecy, which,

(*a*) Lam. iv. 7.

* Concerning the Nazarites ſee Ainſworth on Numb. vi. Relandi Antiq. Hebræor. part ii. cap. x. Leuſden. Philolog. hebræo-mixt. diſſert. xxii. Spanhem. Dubia Evang. p. ii. dub. xciii. xciv. Meinhard. de Naziræatu Pauli, ubi ſupra; and Sigonius de Republ. Hebræor. lib. v. cap. viii. cum notis Nicolai, Ludg. Bat. 1701.

(*b*) Matt. ii. 23. (*c*) Mark xiv. 67. xvi. 6. Luke iv. 34. (*d*) Matt. xxvi. 71. John xviii. 7. 8. Acts ii. 22. (*e*) Matt. ii. 23.

which, at leaſt in expreſs words, is no where to be found in all the Old Teſtament, hath given the criticks and commentators no little trouble: "that it might be fulfilled, ſaith he, which was ſpoken by the prophets, he ſhall be called a Nazarene." Some indeed ſuppoſe the reference is to what is ſaid of Sampſon *, whom they take to be a type of Chriſt, "The child ſhall be a Nazarite unto God (*a*):" and this they ſay, was accompliſhed in his antitype. Others † conceive the prophecy is to be found in Iſaiah, where Chriſt is termed נצר netzer, "the branch (*b*)." Witſius thinks he diſcovers it in the book of Job (*c*), and in ſeveral other places, where God is called נוצר notzer, the "preſerver of Men ‡." However, there is one very material objection againſt all theſe ſolutions, that they give no account how this was fulfilled by Chriſt's being at Nazareth. Either therefore we muſt acquieſce in the opinion of Chryſoſtom §, that the paſſage here referred to is loſt ‖; or, in that more probable one of Jerom, that the evangeliſt does not here refer to any one particular paſſage, but to what ſeveral of the prophets had in effect ſaid. For in that he uſes the word prophets in the plural number, it is evident, ſaith that father, he did not

* Kidder on the Meſſiah, part ii. p. 67, 68. 2d. edit. fol. 1726.

(*a*) Judg. xiii. 5.

† See Hammond on Matt. ii. 23. and Deylingius in his obſervationes ſacræ, pars 1. obſerv. xl. §. iii. p. 177, 178. Lipſiæ 1720.

(*b*) Iſa. xi. 1. (*c*) Job vii. 20.

‡ Meletem. Diſſ. ii. §. xvi,—xvii. p. 285,—287.

§ Homil. in Matt. ix.

‖ So Mr. Whiſton ſuppoſes, ſee his ſermons at Boyle's lecture on the accompliſhment of propheſies, p. 54. Cambridge 1708.

not take the words from the ſcripture, but the ſenſe only *. Now being called a Nazarene is the ſame thing as being one, the Hebrews expreſſing word and thing by the ſame term. The name of God in many places ſignifies God himſelf. "His name ſhall be called," means he ſhall be, "wonderful, counſellor, the mighty God, the everlaſting father, the prince of peace (*a*)." "My houſe ſhall be called, ſignifies my houſe ſhall be, the houſe of prayer (*b*)." The meaning then of Chriſt's being called Ναζωραιος may be, that he ſhall be deſpiſed and reproached, according to a variety of predictions (*c*), which were accompliſhed, in one inſtance at leaſt, by his being called a Nazarite from his having dwelt at Nazareth, that being a town of ſuch ill repute that it was commonly thought no good could come out of it (*d*); and our Saviour's being ſuppoſed to come out of it being one occaſion of his being deſpiſed and rejected by the Jews (*e*).

Nevertheleſs the appellation Ναζαρηνος, of Nazareth, coming to be added to Jeſus, to diſtinguiſh him from all others of the ſame name, we find it ſometimes applied to him when no reproach was intended, as by St. Peter (*f*), and by an angel (*g*). It is however, generally uſed by the Jews as a term of reproach, not only in reſpect to our Saviour himſelf, but to his diſciples after his aſcention. They ſtiled them "the ſect of the Nazarenes (*b*)." Nevertheleſs

* See the paſſage quoted by Whitby on Matt. ii. 23.

(*a*) Iſa. ix. 6. (*b*) Iſa. lvi. 7. Mark. xi. 17. (*c*) Pſal. xxii. 6. lxix. 9. Iſa. liii. 3.—5. Zech. xi. 12, 13. (*d*) John i. 46. (*e*) John vii. 52. (*f*) Acts ii. 22. iii. 6. iv. 10. (*g*) Mark xvi. 6. (*h*) Acts xxiv. 5.

leſs the diſciples of Chriſt, after they had generally taken the name of Chriſtians, turned the tables upon the Jews, giving this title of reproach to the judaiſing Chriſtians; as we learn from Epiphanius, who ſays, the Nazareans were the ſame with the Jews in every thing relating to the doctrine and ceremonies of the Old Teſtament, only differing from them in this, that they profeſſed to believe, that Jeſus Chriſt was the Meſſiah *. Theſe were the heretics Godwin ſpeaks of under the name of Nazarites. But the hiſtory and dogmata of this ſect belong rather to Chriſtian, than to jewiſh antiquities †.

As to the Rechabites, though they dwelt among the Iſraelites, they did not belong to any of their tribes, for they were Kenites, as appears from the ſecond chapter of the firſt book of Chronicles, where the Kenites are ſaid to have come of Hemath the father of the houſe of Rechab (*a*). Theſe Kenites, afterwards ſtiled Rechabites, were of the family of Jethro, otherwiſe called Hobab, whoſe daughter Moſes married; for "the children of the Kenite, Moſes's father-in-law," it is ſaid, "went up out of the city of Palm-trees with the children of Judah, and dwelt among the people (*b*);" and we read of "Hober the Kenite, who was of the children of Hobab the father-in-law of Moſes, who had ſevered himſelf from the Kenites," or from

* Epiphan. adverſus Hæreſes, hær. xxix. §. vii. apud oper. tom 1. p. 122. edit. Petav. Colon. 1682.

† See on this title of Chriſt, Spanhem. Dubia Evangel. part. ii. dub. xc, xci, xciii. Witſii Meletem. Diſſert. ii. and the commentators on Matt. ii. 23.

(*a*) 1 Chron. ii. 55. (*b*) Judg. i. 16.

from the bulk of them who ſettled in the tribe of Judah, "and pitched his tent in the plain of Zaanaim (*a*)." They appear to have ſprung from Midian, the ſon of Abraham by Keturah (*b*), for Jethro, from whom they are deſcended, is called a Midianite (*c*). This Jethro was invited by Moſes his ſon in law to leave his country and ſettle with his family among the Iſraelites. At firſt he refuſed (*d*); but afterwards, being importuned (*e*), it ſeems, he conſented; ſince we find his poſterity ſettled among the Iſraelites, with whom they continued till their lateſt ages. Balaam, therefore, celebrates their prudence and happineſs, in putting themſelves under the protection of God's favourite nation, though he foretels that they ſhould be fellow ſufferers in the captivity (*f*). Of this family was Jonadab, the ſon of Rechab, a man of eminent zeal for the pure worſhip of God againſt idolatry, who aſſiſted king Jehu in deſtroying the houſe of Ahab; and the worſhippers of Baal (*g*). It was he who gave that rule of life to his children and poſterity, which we read of in the thirty-fifth chapter of Jeremiah (*h*). It conſiſted of theſe three articles:

1ſt, That they ſhould drink no wine.

2dly, That they ſhould neither poſſeſs nor occupy any houſes, fields or vineyards.

3dly, That they ſhould dwell in tents.

In theſe regulations he ſeems to have had no religious, but meerly a prudential view, as is intimated in the reaſon aſſigned for them (*i*), "that you may live many days in the land where

(*a*) Judg. iv. 11. (*b*) Gen. xxv. 2. (*c*) Numb. x. 29. (*d*) ver. 30. (*e*) ver. 31, 32. (*f*) Numb. xxiv. 21, 22. (*g*) 2 Kings x. 15, 16, 23. &c.
(*h*) Jerem. xxxv. 6, 7. (*i*) ver. 7.

where you are ſtrangers." And this would be the natural conſequence of obſerving theſe rules, inaſmuch

1ſt, As their temperate way of living would very much contribute to preſerve their health: and as

2dly, They would hereby avoid giving umbrage to, and exciting the envy of the Jews who might have been provoked by their engaging and ſucceeding in the principal buſineſs in which they themſelves were employed, namely, tillage and vine dreſſing, to expel them their country; by which they would have been deprived of the religious advantages they then enjoyed. That they might, therefore, be under no temptation to plant and cultivate vineyards, he forbad them the uſe of wine.

Should it be enquired, how they maintained themſelves, it may be anſwered, they are in the firſt book of Chronicles called ſcribes (*a*), which intimates, that they were engaged in ſome ſort of literary employments.

I ſuppoſe the reaſon of Godwin's treating of the Nazarites and Rechabites in the ſame chapter is, that neither of them drank wine; for in no other reſpect were they alike, the former being a religious, and the latter meerly a prudential and civil inſtitution *.

(*a*) 1 Chron. ii. 55.

* Vid. Witſii Diſſert. de Rechabitis, prefixed to his latin tranſlation of Godwin's Moſes and Aaron, inſerted into Hottinger's edition, and printed likewiſe in Witſii Miſcellan. tom. 2.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

Of the ASSIDEANS.

AFTER the ſpirit of prophecy ceaſed, and there were no inſpired perſons to whom the Jews could apply, to decide their religious doubts and diſputes, different opinions ſoon ſprang up among them and divided them into various ſects and parties; the chief of which were the Phariſees, the Sadducees, and the Eſſenes, all ſuppoſed to ariſe from the Aſſideans, who are entitled, therefore, to our firſt attention.

The hebrew word חסידים chaſidim, is uſed in ſeveral places of ſcripture appellatively, for good and pious men (*a*); but never, I apprehend, for a religious ſect. In the apocryphal book of the Maccabees, indeed, we often meet with the ασιδαιοι, a word plainly derived from the hebrew חסידים chaſidim; as in the following paſſage: "There came to Mattathias a company of Aſſideans, who were mighty men of Iſrael, even all ſuch as were voluntarily devoted unto the law (*b*)." Theſe Aſſideans, ſpoken of in

(*a*) Pſal. cxlix. 1. cxlv. 10. Iſai. lvii. 1. Mic. vii. 2. (*b*) 1 Macc. ii. 42. See alſo chap. vii. 13, and 2 Macc. xiv. 16.

in the Maccabees, have generally been ſuppoſed to be ſome ſect, ſubſiſting at that time. Yet, as Joſephus wrote of the ſame times, and of the ſame affairs, without mentioning any ſuch ſect, ſome have doubted, and not without reaſon, whether there ever was any ſuch, and whether the word ασιδαιοι be not uſed in the Maccabees, as חסידים chaſidim is in the hebrew bible, for pious perſons in general, even ſuch as "were voluntarily devoted unto the law." And it is no improbable conjecture, that as they were perſons generally, of that character, who, in defence of their law and religion, firſt adhered to Mattathias and afterward to his ſon Judas Maccabeus, the name ασιδαιοι, or ſaints, was by their enemies converted into a term of reproach and ſcorn, as the word puritans was in the laſt century, and ſaints very often is now. And as I ſee no ſufficient evidence, of the ασιδαιοι, in the time of the Maccabees, being a diſtinct ſect from other pious Jews, I lay no ſtreſs, upon Godwin's diſtinction betwixt the צדיקים tſadikim and the חסידים chaſidim, which he ſaith took place after the captivity, and conſiſted in the following particulars: the Tſadikim gave themſelves to the ſtudy of the ſcripture; the chaſidim ſtudied how to add to the ſcripture; the former would conform to whatever the law required; the latter would be holy above the law: thus to the repairing of the temple, the maintaining of ſacrifices, the relief of the poor, &c. they would voluntarily add over and above, to that which the law required.

Neither do I think it probable, as Godwin ſuppoſes, that this apoſtle refers to any ſuch diſtinction, when he ſaith, "Scarcely for a righteous man, δικαιου, would one die, yet peradventure

venture for a good man, αγαθου, ſome would even dare to die (a)." By the αγαθος, or good man, the apoſtle rather meant a kind, benevolent, charitable man, than ſuch as were for adding to the divine law, and performing works of ſupererrogation. In this ſenſe the word αγαθος is continually uſed in the New Teſtament. For inſtance, in the goſpel of St. Matthew we meet with this expreſſion, "Is thine eye evil becauſe I am good, or beneficent, αγαθος (b)?" In the epiſtle to the Romans, "Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good," αγαθω, with kind and generous actions (c). In the epiſtle to Philemon το αγαθον means "thy kindneſs (d);" and in the apocryphal book of Eccleſiaſticus αγαθος οφθαλμος ſignifies "the liberal eye (e)." The meaning and deſign of the apoſtle therefore, in the paſſage before us, may be thus repreſented: So engaging are the charms of generoſity and benevolence above mere righteouſneſs and juſtice, that though ſcarcely any man will hazard his life for one who has nothing but the latter to recommend him, ſeveral might be found who would run this important riſque to prevent the death or deſtruction of a diſintereſted and generous friend. But the love of Chriſt (for it is to illuſtrate that love the apoſtle makes this obſervation,) appears to be far more free, generous and exalted than any inſtance of human friendſhip, in that when we were yet ſinners, and poſſeſſed therefore of none of

(a) Rom. v. 7, 8.
(b) Matt. xx. 15.
(c) Rom. xii. 21.
(d) Philem. ver. 14.
(e) Eccluſ. xxxv. 8.

of theſe good or amiable qualities to recommend us, he laid down his life for us *.

The צדיקים tſadikim, Godwin imagines, were the ſame with the קראים karraim, or Karraites. It is certain the Karraites were anciently a conſiderable ſect, which is ſtill in being in Poland and Ruſſia, but chiefly in Turkey and Egypt.

They have their name from the chaldee word קרא kara, ſcriptura ſacra, becauſe they adhered to the ſcriptures, as the whole and only rule of their faith and practice; which occaſioned their being called קראים karraim, textuales or ſcriptuarii, while thoſe who adhered to the traditions taught by the rabbies, were called רבנים rabbanim, rabbiniſtæ.

Theſe party names were firſt given them about thirty years before Chriſt, when, upon the diſſenſion betwixt Hillel the preſident of the Sanhedrim and Shammai the vice-preſident, by which their reſpective ſcholars were liſted into two parties, betwixt whom there were perpetual conteſts, thoſe that were of the opinion of the Karraites ſided with the ſchool of Shammai, and thoſe who were zealous for traditions with the ſchool of Hillel. Nevertheleſs, though the name קראים karraim be thus modern, the ſect boaſts of their high antiquity; for they ſay, they are the followers of Moſes and the prophets, as they undoubtedly are on account of their adhering to the ſcriptures, in oppoſi-

* Concerning the Aſſideans conſult Druſius de Haſidæis, and de tribus ſectis Judæorum, lib. iv. cap. x,—xiii. and alſo his Quæſt. hebr. lib. i. quæſt. xlvii. Scaliger's Elenchus Trihæreſeôs Judæorum, cap. xxii. Fuller's Miſcell. ſacra, lib. i. cap. 8. and Prideaux's Connect. part. ii. book 5. ſub anno 107. vol. 3. p. 256, 257. edit. 10.

tion to human traditions. Yet Dr. Prideaux ſays, they did not reject all traditions abſolutely, only refuſed them the ſame authority as they allowed to the written word. As human helps conducive to their better underſtanding the ſcriptures they were content to admit them, but not to put them on a foot with the written oracles of God, as all the other Jews did *.

The Karraites differ alſo from the reſt of the Jews in this, that they read the ſcriptures, as well as their liturgies, every where both in publick and private, in the language of the country in which they dwell; at Conſtantinople, in modern Greek; in Caffa, in Turkiſh, &c †.

As the ſchool of Hillel prevailed againſt that of Shammai, the rabbinits became the popular ſect, and the Karraites were looked upon as ſchiſmatics and heretics, being loaded with much reproach by the other Jews; though in reality of all their ſects, they were the pureſt and moſt pious: They are frequently branded with the name Sadducees by the jewiſh rabbies, by whom I ſuppoſe Godwin was led into the miſtake which he commits, when he repreſents them, as rejecting, not only traditions, but all ſcripture except the five books of Moſes. The truth is, all the Sadducees agreed with the Karraites in rejecting traditions, but the Karraites by no means agreed with the Sadducees in rejecting the greater part of the ſcriptures.

As the rabbinits interpret the ſcriptures by the traditions, which the Karraites reject, it is no wonder they differ in the ſenſe of many texts, and

* Prideaux's Connect. part. ii. book v. ſub anno 107. vol. 3. p. 476.

† Hottingeri Theſaur. philolog. inter addenda, p. 583. edit. Tigur. 1649.

and practise the rites of worship in a different manner. Reland reckons up six articles of difference betwixt the Karraites and other Jews:

1st, The rabbinists reckon the feast of the new moon, and the beginning of the month, by astronomical calculations; the Karraites begin the month with the first appearance of the moon after the change.

2dly, The rabbinists killed the paschal lamb in the afternoon, when the sun was declining; the Karraites, not till after the sun was set.

3dly, The rabbinists admitted the whole family to eat the passover; the Karraites, none but the males, and of them only such as were of age.

4thly, The rabbinists held, that what remained of the passover was to be burnt on the sixteenth day of the month, or if that proved the sabbath, on the seventeenth; the Karraites, that it was always to be burnt on the fifteenth (a).

5thly, They differed about the meaning of the law concerning the offering of the sheaf of the first fruits (b). The rabbinists offered it the day after the passover; the Karraites thought it was to be offered the day after the sabbath next to the passover.

6thly, In the feast of tabernacles, the rabbinists carry about branches and a citron, in a sort of procession; the Karraites allow of no such ceremony *.

(a) See Exod. xii. 10. (b) Lev. xxiii. 10, 11.

* Vid. Relandi Antiquitat. Hebræor. part. ii. cap. ix. §. xii. See also on the subject of the Karraites, Trigland. de Sectâ Karæorum. Father Simon's Histoire critique Vieux Testament, liv. 1. ch. 29. or the latin edition, p. 145. and also his Disquisitiones criticæ, cap. 12. R. Mardochæus Karæus, apud Wolfii Notitiam Karæorum. Basnag. hist. of the Jews, book 2. chap. 8, 9.

It may not be improper to obſerve, that the Mohammedans are diſtinguiſhed into two ſects, in ſome meaſure analogous to the rabbiniſts and Karraites among the Jews; namely, the Sonnites and the Shiites. The Sonnites are ſo called, becauſe they acknowledge the authority of the Sonna, or collection of traditions concerning the ſayings and actions of their prophet, which is a kind of ſupplement to the Koran, directing the obſervance of ſeveral things there omitted, and in name as well as deſign anſwering to the Miſhna of the Jews.

The Shiites, which name properly ſignifies ſectaries or adherents in general, but is peculiarly applied to the ſect of Ali, reject the Sonna as apocryphal and fabulous. Theſe acknowledge Ali, the ſon-in-law of Mohammed, for his true and lawful ſucceſſor, and even prefer him to Mohammed himſelf. The Turks are Sonnites; the Perſians Shiites. Theſe two mohammedan ſects have as great an antipathy to one another, as any two ſects either of Jews or Chriſtians. So greatly is Spinoza miſtaken, in preferring the order of the mohammedan church to that of the Roman, becauſe no ſchiſms have ariſen in the former ſince its birth *.

* Vid. Spinoz. Opera poſthuma, p. 613, and Sale's preliminary diſcourſe to his tranſlation of the Koran. Sect. viii. p. 175, 178. London, 1734.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

Of the PHARISEES.

THE Phariſees derived their name not, as ſome have ſuppoſed, from פרש pharaſh, expoſuit, becauſe they were in the higheſt reputation for expounding the law; for it appears by the rabbies, there were women Phariſees, to whom that office did not appertain: but either, as Godwin apprehends, from פרש pirreſh, in the conjugation pihel; or from פרס pharas, deviſit, partitus eſt, which is ſometimes written with a ש, Sin (*a*). פרושים pheruſhim, in the hebrew dialect; or פרישין pheriſhin, or פרישיא pheriſhe, according to the Chaldee, ſignifies perſons who were ſeparated from others; which name therefore was aſſumed by the Phariſees, not becauſe they held ſeparate aſſemblies for divine worſhip, but becauſe they pretended to a more than ordinary ſanctity and ſtrictneſs in religion. Thus in the Acts of the apoſtles the Phariſees are ſaid to be "ακριβεστατη αιρεσις," the moſt exact ſect of the jewiſh religion (*b*): agreeable to the account Joſephus gives, that this ſect was thought "συστεβεστερον ειναι των αλλων"

(*a*) See Mic. iii. 3. Lam. iv. 4. (*b*) Acts xxvi. 5.

to be more pious and devout than others, and to interpret the law with greater accuracy *. In another place he ſaith, they valued themſelves in their exactneſs in the law, and on their ſkill in the interpretation of it; and ſeemed to excel all others in the knowledge and obſervation of the cuſtoms of their fathers †.

It is very uncertain when this ſect firſt ſprung up; but there is no doubt, its date, as well as that of all other religious ſects among the Jews, ought to be fixed later than the death of Malachi, when the ſpirit of prophecy ceaſed from Iſrael. We read, indeed, of perſons much of the ſame ſpirit and temper with the Phariſees in Iſaiah; who ſaid "ſtand by thyſelf, come not near me; for I am holier than thou (*a*)." But this only ſhows, there were proud hypocrites before the ſect of the Phariſees aroſe.

I know not upon what authority Godwin makes Antigonus Socheus to be the founder of this ſect three hundred years before Chriſt. Dr. Lightfoot thinks, that phariſaiſm roſe up gradually, and was long before it came to the maturity of a ſect; but when that was, he does not pretend to determine ‡. It appears by Joſephus, that in the time of John Hyrcanus, the high-prieſt, and prince of the Aſmonean line, about an hundred and eight years before Chriſt, the ſect was not only formed, but made a conſiderable figure. Inſomuch that this prince thought it for his intereſt to endeavour to ingratiate himſelf with the Phariſees, and

* Joſeph. de bello judaic. lib. 1. cap. v. §. 2. p. 63. Haverc. See alſo lib. ii. cap. viii. §. 14. p. 166.

† Antiq. lib. xvii. cap. ii. §. 4. p. 830. & in vitâ ſuâ, §. 38. p. 18. (*a*) Iſai. lxv. 5.

‡ Horæ hebr. in Matt. iii. 7.

and gain them to his party. For this end he invited the heads of them to an entertainment, and having regaled them, paid them the complement to deſire, that if they ſaw any thing in his adminiſtration unacceptable to God, or unjuſt or injurious to men, they would admoniſh him of it, and give him their advice and inſtructions, how it might be reformed and amended. Whereupon one Eleazar, a ſour Phariſee, told him, "that if he would approve himſelf a juſt man, he muſt quit the prieſthood, and content himſelf with the civil government." Upon that he was highly provoked, and went over to the Sadducees *. To what a height of popularity and power this ſect was grown about eighty years before Chriſt, appears from another paſſage in Joſephus †: When king Alexander Janneus lay on his death-bed, and his wife Alexandra was exceedingly troubled at the ill ſtate in which ſhe found ſhe and her children would be left, on account of the hatred which ſhe knew the Phariſees bore to her huſband and his family; he adviſed her by all means to careſs the Phariſees, ſince that would be the way to ſecure her the affection of the bulk of the nation; for there were no ſuch friends where they loved, and no ſuch enemies where they hated, and whether they ſpoke true or falſe, good or evil of any perſon, they would be alike believed by the common people. With this view he injoined her, after his death to commit his body to their diſpoſal; and at the ſame time to aſſure them, that ſhe would ever reſign

* Joſeph. Antiq. lib. xiii. cap. x. §. 5, 6. p. 662. 663.

† Ubi ſupra, cap. xv. §. 5. & cap. xvi. §. 1. p. 675, 676.

herſelf to their authority and direction: Do this, ſaid he, and you will not only gain me an honourable funeral, but yourſelf and your children a ſecure ſettlement in the government. And ſo it accordingly happened; his funeral was more ſumptuous than any of his predeceſſors, and his queen was firmly eſtabliſhed in the ſupreme adminiſtration of the nation.

According to Baſnage one Ariſtobulus, an alexandrian Jew, and a peripatetic philoſopher, who flouriſhed about 125 years before Chriſt and wrote ſome commentaries on the ſcripture in the allegorical way, was the author of thoſe traditions, by an adherence to which chiefly the Phariſees were diſtinguiſhed from other jewiſh ſects*. But it is by no means probable, ſuch an heap of traditions ſhould ſpring up at once; but rather gradually, and ſo according to Lightfoot † did the ſect of the Phariſees itſelf, till at length it became the moſt conſiderable of all.

Their diſtinguiſhing dogmata may be all, in a manner, referred to their holding the traditions of the elders; which they not only ſet upon an equal footing with the written law, but in many caſes explained the former by the latter, quite contrary to its true intent and meaning. And thus "they made the commandment of God of none effect by their traditions (*a*)." They pretended to derive theſe from the ſame fountain with the written word itſelf; for they ſay, that when Moſes waited upon God forty days in the mount, he received from him a double law; one in writing, the other

* Baſnage's hiſtory of the Jews, book ii. chap. ix. §. 2. p. 110. London, 1708. † Lightfoot, horæ hebr. Matt. iii. 7. §. iii. (*a*) Matt. xv. 6.

other traditionary, containing the ſenſe and explication of the former; that Moſes, being come to his tent, repeated it firſt to Aaron, then to Ithamar and Eleazar his ſons, then to the ſeventy elders, and laſtly to all the people. The rabbies further inform us, that Moſes at his death repeated the oral law again to Joſhua; that he delivered it to the elders, they to the prophets, and the prophets to the wiſe men of the great ſynagogue; and ſo it was handed through ſeveral generations, till at length R. Judah Haccodheſh, reflecting on the unſettled condition of his nation after the deſtruction of Jeruſalem and the jewiſh polity, and how apt theſe traditionary precepts would be to be forgotten in their diſperſion and oppreſſion, committed them to writing about 150 years after Chriſt *, and called his book the Miſhna, or the ſecond law, of which we have formerly given an account.

The dogmata of the Phariſees may be diſtinguiſhed into doctrinal and practical.

The diſtinguiſhing doctrines, maintained by this ſect, were concerning predeſtination and free-will, angels and ſpirits, and the future ſtate and reſurrection.

1ſt, As to predeſtination and free-will, they went a middle way betwixt the Sadducees, who denied the pre-determination of human actions and events, and the Eſſenes, who aſcribed all things to fate and to the ſtars. Whereas the Phariſees, according to Joſephus, aſcribed ſome things to fate, but held that other things were left in a man's own power, ſo that he might do them or not †: Or rather, according to another account he

* See p. 400. note †

† Joſeph. Antiq. lib. xiii. cap. v. §, 9. p. 649.

he gives *, they held, that all things were decreed of God, yet not ſo as to take away the freedom of man's will in acting.

2dly, The Phariſees held the doctrine of angels and ſeparate human ſpirits, which the Sadducees denied (*a*).

3dly, As to the future ſtate and reſurrection, the Phariſees differed both from the Sadducees and Eſſenes. For, whereas the former held that both ſoul and body utterly periſhed at death, and had no exiſtence after it; and the latter, that the ſoul would continue to exiſt after death, but without any future union with the body, the Phariſees maintained the reſurrection of the bodies, at leaſt, of good men, and the future and eternal ſtate of retribution to all men (*b*). Joſephus, who was himſelf a Phariſee, gives this account of their doctrine in theſe points, "Ψυχην δε πασαν μεν αφθαρτον, μεταβαινειν δε εις ετερον σωμα, την των αγαθων μονην, την δε των φαυλων αιδιω τιμωρια χολαζεσθαι: Every ſoul is immortal, thoſe of the good only enter into another body, but thoſe of the bad are tormented with everlaſting puniſhment †. From whence it has been pretty generally concluded, that the reſurrection they held was only a pythagorean one, namely, the tranſmigration of the ſoul into another body; from which they excluded all that were notoriouſly wicked, who were doomed at once to eternal puniſhment; but their opinion was that thoſe who were guilty only of leſſer crimes were puniſhed for them in

* De bello Judaic. lib. ii. cap. viii. §. 14. p. 166. Antiq. lib. xviii. cap. 1. §. 3. p. 871.

(*a*) Acts xxiii. 8.

(*b*) Acts xxiii. 8.

† De bell. judaic. lib. ii. cap. viii. §. 14. p. 166.

in the bodies into which their ſouls were next ſent.

It is ſuppoſed, that it was upon this notion the diſciples aſked our Lord, "Did this man ſin, or his parents, that he was born blind (*a*)?" and that ſome ſaid (*b*), Chriſt was "John the baptiſt, ſome Elias, others Jeremias, or one of the prophets *."

This was undoubtedly the opinion of the Pythagoreans † and Platoniſts ‡, and was embraced by ſome among the Jews; as by the author of the book of Wiſdom, who ſays, "that being good he came into a body undefiled (*c*)." Nevertheleſs it is queſtioned by ſome perſons, whether the words of Joſephus, before quoted, are a ſufficient evidence of this doctrine of the metempſychoſis being received by the whole ſect of the Phariſees; for μετασωμάτωσις εἰς ἕτερον σῶμα, paſſing into another or different body, may only denote its receiving a body at the reſurrection; which will be another, not in ſubſtance, but in quality; as it is ſaid of Chriſt at his tranſfiguration, τὸ εἶδος τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἕτερον, "the faſhion of his countenance was" another, or as we render it, was "altered (*d*)."

As to the opinion, which ſome entertained concerning our Saviour, that he was either John the baptiſt, or Elias, or Jeremias, or one of

(*a*) John ix. 2. (*b*) Matt. xvi. 14.

* See Prideaux's Connect. part. 2. book 5. ſub anno 107, before Chriſt. vol. 3. p. 479, 480. edit. 10. London 1729.

† Diogen. Laert. de vitis Philoſoph. lib. viii. de vitâ Pythag. Segm. 14. & not. Aldobrandini in loc. vol. 1. p. 499. edit. Amſtel. 1692.

‡ Plato in Phædro. p. 1233. B, C, D, E, edit. Ficin. Francof. 1602. & Diogen. Laert. de Vitis Philoſ. lib. iii. de vitâ Platonis, Segm. 67. vol. 1. p. 204, 205.

(*c*) chap. viii. 20. (*d*) Luke ix. 29.

of the prophets (*a*), it is not aſcribed to the Phariſees in particular; and if it were, I do not ſee how it could be founded on the doctrine of the metempſychoſis; ſince the ſoul of Elias, now inhabiting the body of Jeſus, would no more make him to be Elias, than ſeveral others had been, in whoſe bodies the ſoul of Elias, according to this doctrine, is ſuppoſed to have dwelt ſince the death of that ancient prophet near a thouſand years before. Beſides, how was it poſſible any perſon that ſaw Chriſt, who did not appear to be leſs than thirty years old, ſhould according to the notion of the metempſychoſis, conceit him to be John the baptiſt, who had been ſo lately beheaded. Surely this apprehenſion muſt be grounded on the ſuppoſition of a proper reſurrection. It was probably, therefore, upon the ſame account, that others took him to be Elias, and others Jeremias. According St. Luke expreſſes it thus, "others ſay, that one of the old prophets is riſen from the dead (*b*)."

It may further be obſerved, that the doctrine of the reſurrection, which St. Paul preached, was not a preſent metempſychoſis, but a real future reſurrection, which he calls "the hope and reſurrection of the dead (*c*)." This he profeſſed as a Phariſee, and for this profeſſion the partizans of that ſect vindicated him againſt the Sadducees (*d*). Upon the whole therefore, it appears moſt reaſonable to adopt the opinion of Reland, though in oppoſition to the ſentiments of many other learned men, that the

(*a*) Matt. xvi. 14.
(*b*) Luke ix. 19.
(*c*) Acts xxiii. 6.
(*d*) ver. 7,—9.

the Phariſees held the doctrine of the reſurrection in a proper ſenſe *.

Thus far their doctrinal opinions appear to have been agreeable to the ſcripture, excepting that one grand principle, that the traditions of the fathers came from God, and were at leaſt upon an equal foot with the ſacred writings. This was the root, the πρωτον ψευδος, of various errors; from hence proceeded moſt of the corrupt practical dogmata of this ſect: Which we are now

2dly, To conſider. Hence, they gave ſo erroneous an interpretation of many texts of ſcripture, explaining them according to their traditions; which was the occaſion of their tranſgreſſing the commandments of God, and making them of none effect (*a*).

Hence they fell into many very ſuperſtitious practices, in which they placed a great part of their religion; ſuch as frequent waſhing their hands, and their houſhold furniture, beyond what the law required (*b*); faſting twice a week (*c*); and if we may credit the talmud, practiſing many painful auſterities and mortifications, whipping themſelves, lying upon flints and thorns, and knocking their heads againſt walls till they made them bleed †.

Hence,

* Reland. Antiq. hebr. part ii. cap. ix. §. 14. p. 278. edit. 3. Traject. Bat. 1717. Concerning the improbability of the Phariſees having held the doctrine of the metempſychoſis in our Saviour's time ſee Budder Hiſtoria eccleſ. vet. Teſtament. tom. ii. per. ii. p. 1203.

(*a*) Matt. xv. 3,—6. (*b*) Mark vii. 3, 4.

(*c*) Luke xviii. 12.

† Miſh. tit. Sotah, cap. 3. §. 4. ſub fin. cum not. Bartenor. & Wagenſeil. Sotah, excerpt. Gemar. cap. 3. §. 11. Druſius de tribus ſectis, lib. ii. cap. xiv. p. 71. edit.

Hence, being buſied about trifles, and taken up with a multitude of rites and ceremonies, they forgot and neglected the great duties of morality. Thus, while they were ſuperſtitiouſly exact "in tything mint, anise, and cummin, they overlooked the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith (*a*);" and by thus placing their religion in things wherein true religion does not conſiſt, they in a manner loſt all notion of ſpiritual piety and godlineſs, and became the moſt finiſhed hypocrites among the Jews. Phariſees and hypocrites are often joined together in the goſpel hiſtory, and ſeveral inſtances of their hypocriſy mentioned, namely, their faſting, almſgiving and making long prayers in the ſynagogues and even in corners of the ſtreets on purpoſe "to be ſeen of men," and to gain their applauſe; and "for a pretence, the better to cover their ſecret wickedneſs (*b*)." In ſhort they placed the whole of religion in outward ceremonial obſervances, and therefore took no pains or care to get their hearts purified; they freely indulged their pride and malice and all other ſorts of ſpiritual wickedneſs; on which account they are compared by our Saviour to whited ſepulchres (*c*); and becauſe they were very exact in their ritual obſervances, in which they abounded beyond others, they looked upon themſelves to be more religious, and the peculiar favourites of heaven, and therefore "they truſted in themſelves that they were righteous, and deſpiſed others

edit. 1. p. 253. edit. Trigland. Buxtorf. ſynag. judaic. cap. xxv. p. 521,—523. edit. 3. Baſil. 1661. See Epiphanius, hær. xvi. § 1. tom. 1. p. 33, 34. edit. Petav.

(*a*) Matt. xxiii. 23. (*b*) Matt. vi. 2, 5, 16. xxii. 5,—7, 14. (*c*) Matt. xxiii. 27.

others (*a*);" and their pride being thus fed, they affected pre-eminence and expected a greater ſhare of reſpect than others (*b*). From the ſame criminal principle they "made broad their phylacteries, and enlarged the borders of their garments (*c*)."

The phylacteries, called by the Jews תפלין tephillin, are little ſcrolls of parchment, in which are written certain ſentences of the law, incloſed in leather caſes, and bound with thongs on the forehead and on the left arm. They are called in Greek φυλακτηρια, from φυλασσω cuſtodio, either becauſe they were ſuppoſed to preſerve the law in memory, or rather, becauſe they were looked upon as a kind of amulets or charms to keep them from danger. Godwin gives an account from the rabbies of the ſentences of the law written in the phylacteries, and the manner of writing and folding them up, which is ſufficiently exact *. I ſhall only obſerve, that the making and wearing theſe phylacteries, as the Jews ſtill do in their private devotions, is owing to a miſinterpretation of thoſe texts †, on which they ground the practice, namely, God's commanding them "to bind the law for a ſign on their hands," and to let it be as frontlets betwixt their eyes, &c (*d*). This precept evidently refers to the whole law of Moſes, and not to the particular ſentences which they wrote in their phylacteries (*e*). The command of writing and

(*a*) Luke xviii. 9. (*b*) Matt. xxiii. 6, 7.
(*c*) ver. 5.

* See Maimon. Tephillin, ſeu de Phylacteriis. Wagenſeil. Sotah, excerpt. Gemar. cap. ii. §. 2. not. 10. p. 397,—418. Altdorf. 1674. and Surenhuſii Tabulæ de Phylacteriis, prefixed to the firſt volume of his edition of the Miſhna.

† See Le Clerc. on Exod. xiii. 9.

(*d*) Deut. vi. 8. (*e*) See ver. 6.

and binding this law as a ſign upon the hands, and as frontlets betwixt the eyes, ought doubtleſs to be underſtood metaphorically, as a charge to remember it, to meditate upon it, to have it as it were continually before their eyes, and to conduct their lives by it; as when Solomon ſays, concerning the commandments of God in general, "bind them about thy neck, write them upon the table of thy heart (a)." The precept therefore, which we are now conſidering, to "bind the words of the law for a ſign upon the hands, and as frontlets betwixt the eyes (b)," is to be explained by the ſentence which precedes it, "Theſe words, which I commanded thee this day, ſhall be in thine heart." In like manner it is ſaid elſewhere, "Ye ſhall lay up my words in your hearts and in your ſouls (c)." However the Jews underſtanding the foregoing precept, not metaphorically but literally, wrote out the ſeveral paſſages wherever it occurs, and to which it ſeems to refer, and bound them upon their foreheads and upon their arms.

It ſeems the Phariſees uſed to "make broad" their phylacteries. This ſome underſtand of the knots of the thongs by which they were faſtened, which were tied very artificially in the form of hebrew letters; and that the pride of the Phariſees induced them to have theſe knots larger than ordinary, as a peculiar ornament. Others ſuppoſed they affected to wear the phylacteries themſelves very large, as if they contained more of the law than was commonly worn by their neighbours, and were therefore a teſtimony of their extraordinary affection for it.

It

(a) Prov. iii. 1, 3. vi. 21. (b) Deut. vi. 8.
(c) Chap. xi. 18.

It is imagined by ſome perſons, that the phylacteries are alluded to in the book of the Revelation (*a*), where the ſubjects of anti-chriſt are ſaid to be diſtinguiſhed by "a mark on their right hands and on their foreheads *."

The Phariſees are further ſaid to "enlarge the borders of their garments," τα κρασπεδα των ιματιων (*b*). Theſe κρασπεδα were the ציצית tſitſith, the fringes, which the Jews are, in the book of Numbers, commanded to wear upon the borders of their garments (*c*). The targum of Onkelos calls them כרוספדין cheruſpedhin, which hath ſo near an affinity with the greek word κρασπεδον, that there is no doubt but it ſignifies the ſame thing; which is therefore an evidence, that the κρασπεδα were the ציצית tſitſith. Theſe were worn by our Saviour, as appears from the following paſſages of St. Matthew, "Behold, a woman, which was diſeaſed with an iſſue of blood twelve years, came behind him, and touched the hem of his garment," κρασπεδου τ ιματιο (*d*)." Again, the inhabitants of Genneſaret are ſaid to have brought unto him their diſeaſed, and to have "beſought him, that they might only touch the hem of his garment," κρασπεδου τ ιματιο (*e*). Κρασπεδον τ ιματιο is, in both theſe paſſages, very improperly tranſlated the "hem of his garment." It ſhould have been rendered the

(*a*) Rev. xiii. 16.

* See a large account of the ſuperſtition of the Jews concerning the phylacteries in Ainſworth on Exod. xiii. 9. Buxtorf's Synag. judaicâ, cap. ix. and Lexic. talmud. in voc. תפלה. Conſult alſo on this ſubject Spenceri Diſſert. de nat. & orig. Phylact. ad calcem. tom. 2. de legibus, edit. Cantab. 1727.

(*b*) See Matt. xxiii. 5. before-cited. (*c*) Numb. xv. 38, 39. (*d*) Matt. ix. 20. (*e*) Matt. xiv. 36.

fringe; and it ſhould ſeem the people imagined there was ſome peculiar virtue or ſanctity in the fringe of our Saviour's garment above any other part, from their expectation of a miraculous cure by touching it. It appears indeed, the later Jews placed a great deal of ſanctity in theſe fringes. Rabbi Menachem on the fifteenth chapter of Numbers, ſaith, when any man is cloathed with a fringe, and goeth out therewith to the door of his habitation, he is ſafe, and God rejoiceth, and the deſtroying angel departeth from thence, and that man ſhall be delivered from all hurt, and from all deſtruction *.

Concerning the form of this fringe, we can only frame an uncertain gueſs from the two hebrew words by which it is expreſſed; namely, ציצית tſitſith (*a*), and גדלים gedhilim (*b*), which is likewiſe rendered by the chaldee paraphraſt גדילין cheruſpedhin. The former, tſitſith, is uſed for a lock of hair (*c*), the latter for a rope, ſuch a Dalilah bound Sampſon with (*d*). From hence it is inferred, that theſe fringes conſiſted of many threads, which hung like hair, and were twiſted like a rope. It was, alſo ordered by the law, that they ſhould put upon the fringe a ribband of blue, or a thread, as the word פתיל pathil, ſeems to be properly rendered in a paſſage of the book of Judges, where it is ſaid concerning Sampſon, that he "broke the withs" with which he was bound, "as a thread פתיל pethil, of tow is broken when it toucheth the fire (*e*):" or elſe it may ſignify lace, as it

* R. Menachem on Numb. xv. quoted by Ainſworth on Numb. xv. 39.

(*a*) Numb xv. 38, 39. (*b*) Deut. xxii. 12.
(*c*) Ezek. viii. 3. (*d*) Judg. xvi. 11, 12.
(*e*) Judg. xvi. 9.

it is rendered in a paſſage of the book of Exodus (*a*), where the ſtring, which faſtened the holy crown to the high-prieſt's mitre, is expreſſed by the ſame word uſed for this blue thread, or lace, upon the fringe of their garments. Whether, therefore, it was a blue thread twiſted with a white through the whole fringe; whether it was a blue lace, by which the fringe was faſtened to the edge of the garment, or whether it was ſewed along the head of the fringe, is what we cannot take upon us to determine.

The uſe of this fringe is ſaid to be, "that they might look upon it, and remember all the commandments of the Lord and do them (*b*)." Some conceive the fringe was to be a diſtinguiſhing badge, which God ordered the people of Iſrael to wear on their clothes, in the nature of a livery, that they might be known for his ſervants, who was not aſhamed to own them for his peculiar people; as he had before, for the ſame purpoſe, ordered them to wear a diſtinguiſhing mark in their fleſh, namely, circumciſion. This account well agrees with the reaſon given for their wearing the fringe, "that they might look upon it, and remember all the commandments of the Lord to do them:" that is, that it might remind them, that as the ſervants of Jehovah whoſe livery they wore, they were bound to do all that he had commanded them. And as by this badge they were to be diſtinguiſhed from the ſervants of all other gods, ſo it was to be a guard upon them from idolatry; accordingly it follows, "that ye ſeek

(*a*) Exod. xxxix. 31. (*b*) Numb. xv. 39.

not after your own hearts, and your own eyes, after which you uſed to go a whoring."

Le Clerc * indeed ſuggeſts, that the Jews borrowed this faſhion of wearing fringes from the Egyptians, becauſe Herodotus, ſpeaking of the Egyptians, ſays, ενδεδυκασι χιτωνας λινεους περι τα σκελεα θυσσανωτους: induli ſunt tunicis lineis circa crura fimbratis †. But why might it not as well be ſuppoſed, the Egyptians learnt it from the Jews, as the Jews from the Egyptians?

After all there are ſome, Calvin in particular ‡, who ſuppoſe theſe fringes to be nothing but ſtrings, with toſſels, at the four corners of their upper garment, which was made of a ſquare piece of cloth, in the ſame faſhion that was afterwards worn by the Greeks and Romans.

This opinion very well agrees with the precept in Deuteronomy, "Thou ſhalt make thee fringes upon the four quarters," wings as the margin renders it, or rather corners "of thy veſture, wherewith thou covereſt thyſelf (*a*)." And the proper uſe of theſe ſtrings was to tye the corners together. Such ſtrings the modern Jews have to their veils, and each ſtring has five knots in it, beſides the toſſel, ſignifying the five books of the law. The rabbies obſerve, that each ſtring conſiſts of eight threads, which added to five, the number of knots, and likewiſe to the numeral value of the letters in the word

* Clerici Annot. in Num. xv. 38.

† Herodot. Enterp. cap. 81. p. 118. edit. Gronov. Ludg. Bat. 1716.

‡ Calvini Comment. in Deut. xxii. 12. oper. tom. 1. p. 522. Amſtel. 1671.

(*a*) Deut. xxii. 12.

word ציצית tſitſith, amounts to ſix hundred and thirteen, the number, according to them, of the precepts of the law. From hence they infer the importance of the command concerning the ציצית tſitſith, he who obſerves it, they ſay, in effect obſerving the whole law *.

The Phariſees are cenſured by our Saviour for enlarging theſe fringes of their garments, which, we may ſuppoſe, they did partly from pride, and partly hypocriſy, as pretending thereby an extraordinary regard for the law. It is reported by Jerom, as quoted by Godwin, that they uſed to have fringes extravagantly long, ſticking thorns in them, that by pricking their legs as they walked, they might put them in mind of the law †.

From the ſame corrupt fountain whence we have derived the other ſuperſtitions and corruptions of the Phariſees, even their attachment to the traditions, we may alſo trace their moſt unreaſonable and malicious oppoſition to our Saviour. For having learnt to interpret the prophecies of the Meſſiah in a carnal ſenſe, and being ſtrongly tinctured with the notion of his being deſigned to be a temporal prince and deliverer, no miracles could overcome their prejudices againſt the meanneſs of Chriſt's appearance, and perſwade them that a perſon,

* Buxtorf. Synag. jud. cap. ix. p. 164. edit. 3. Baſil. 1661. & Lex. Talmud. in voc. ציצית.

† Concerning the fringes ſee Ainſworth on Numb. xv. 38, 39, Deut. xxii. 12. Buxtorfii ſynag. judaic. cap. ix. p. 160,—170. & Lexic. Talmud. in voc. ציצית. Druſius de ſectis Judæor. lib. ii. cap. xvi. p. 267. edit. Trigland. & Leuſden. Philolog. hebræo-mixt. diſſert. xvii. p. 118, 119. edit. 2. Ultraject. 1682.

who made no pretence to civil authority and military power, could poſſibly be "Meſſiah, the prince," the "ſon of David and the Saviour of Iſrael." They got him, therefore, apprehended, condemned and executed as an impoſtor *.

* See an account of the Phariſees in Druſius de tribus ſectis Judæorum, lib. ii. cap. xii.—ult. in Lightfoot, horæ hebr. Matt. iii. 7. in Baſnage's hiſtory of the Jews, book ii. chap. 10, 11. in Clerici Eccleſiaſt. hiſtor. prolegom. ſect. i. cap. ii. p. 5,—12. and in Prideaux's Connect. part 2. book 5. vol. 3. p. 479.—483. edit. 10.

5 DE60

CHAP.

CHAP. XI.

Of the Sadducees and Samaritans.

AS for the Sadducees, Epiphanius derives the name from צדק tſedhek, juſtitia *; but that derivation neither ſuits the word Sadducee, nor the true character of the ſect. For ſo far were they from being eminently righteous, that they are commonly ſaid to be the moſt wicked and profligate of all the Jews; neither were they given to boaſt of their own righteouſneſs, as the Phariſees were.

Another etymology, which Theophylact mentions together with the former †, is therefore eſteemed to be the more probable one; that their name was derived απο αιρεσιαρχου Σαδωκ. This he borrowed from the Talmud, which tells us, that Sadoc was a ſcholar of Antigonus Sochæus, preſident of the ſanhedrim about 260 years before Chriſt; who having inculcated upon his ſcholars, that they ought to

* Epiphan. adverſus Hæres. lib. i. hæres xiv. p. 31. C. edit. Petav. Colon. 1682.

† Theophylact. Comment. in Matt. iii. 7. p. 18.

ſerve God out of pure love to him, and not in a ſervile manner, either for fear of puniſhment or hope of reward; Sadoc, not underſtanding this ſpiritual doctrine, concluded there was no future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments, and accordingly taught and propagated that error after his maſter's death *. However that be, (for I muſt confeſs with me talmudical ſtories have but little credit) this is ſaid to have been the doctrine of the Sadducees. That they denied the reſurrection, and that there are angels and ſpirits, appears from the account given of them in the New Teſtament (*a*). According to Joſephus, they rejected the traditions of the Phariſees †; they not only denied the reſurrection of the body, but the life and exiſtence of the ſoul after death; they likewiſe denied all divine decrees, and held that man was abſolutely maſter of his own actions, with a full freedom to do either good or evil as he thought proper; that God did not influence him in doing either; and that his proſperity or adverſity are placed within his own power, and are reſpectively the effect of his wiſdom or his folly ‡; a notion, which in effect amounts to denying a providence, and to the ſubverſion of all religion. So that they were upon the whole, epicurean deiſts in all other reſpects, except that they acknowledged the world to have been created, and perhaps to be upheld and preſerv-

ed

* Miſhn. tit. Pirke Abhoth, cap. 1. §. 3. & Maimon. in loc. See Lightfoot, Horæ hebraic. in Acts xxiii. 8.

(*a*) Matt. xxii. 23. Acts xxiii. 8.

† Joſeph. Antiq. lib. xiii. cap. x. §. 6. p. 663. Antiq. lib. xviii. cap. i. §. 4. p. 871. edit. Haverc.

‡ Antiq. lib. xviii. cap. i. §. 4. p. 871. De bello judaic. lib. ii. cap. viii. §. 14. p. 166. Antiq. lib. xiii. cap. v. §. 9. p. 649.

ed by God. This hiſtorian gives them a very bad character as to their morals, and ſays, "they were a ſet of men churliſh and moroſe toward each other, and cruel and ſavage to all beſides *." However, we muſt remember, that Joſephus himſelf was a Phariſee, of an oppoſite ſect, and that ſuch perſons are very apt, from their mutual averſion, to miſrepreſent and calumniate each other. Perhaps his account of the Sadducees is not without ſome tincture of phariſaical miſrepreſentation; for it can hardly be ſuppoſed, that men of ſuch very corrupt principles, as he repreſents them, ſhould continue uncenſured and uncondemned by the ſanhedrim, much leſs, be ſuffered to fill the higheſt poſts in church and ſtate; as we find they did, it appearing, that Caiaphas the high-prieſt, who condemned our Saviour, was of this ſect (*a*). Beſides, the character given them by this hiſtorian, is altogether inconſiſtent with their receiving, which all admit they did, the five books of Moſes, even though it were true, that they rejected all the other ſacred books; which Godwin lays to their charge, but from which Scaliger endeavours to exculpate them †. Indeed the ſilence of Joſephus, renders this charge upon them juſtly ſuſpected; for though he often mentions them, and loads them with imputations of many corrupt principles and practices, yet he never ſpeaks of their rejecting any part of the holy ſcriptures; which no doubt he would have done, if it had been fact. Nay, he ſays, that though they rejected the traditions of the fathers, they received

* De bello judaic. lib. ii. cap. viii. §. 14. p. 166.
(*a*) Acts v. 17.
† Elench. Trihæres. cap. xvi.

ceived τα γεγραμμενα, the written books *; an expreſſion too general, and too much in their favour, to have flowed from his pen, if he could with any plauſibility have accuſed them of rejecting any one of them. And even in the talmud the Sadducees are introduced as diſputing and arguing from paſſages in the prophets, and the Phariſees as anſwering them from the ſame books †; which implies that thoſe books were received by them; nor are they ever accuſed by any of the ancient rabbies with rejecting them. Some of them indeed ſtile them כותיים chuthiim, which is another name for the Samaritans. But, perhaps, that was only as a term of reproach, which the Jews beſtowed upon thoſe whom they hated; as upon our Saviour, who, they ſaid, was "a Samaritan, and had a devil (*a*)." However, the Samaritans admitting only the five books of Moſes to be canonical, hence it hath come to paſs, that the Sadducees being by the rabbies ſometimes ſtiled כותיים chuthiim, or Samaritans, hath been the occaſion, without ſufficient reaſon, of the Sadducees being ſuppoſed, as well as the Samaritans, to have rejected all the writings of the Old Teſtament, except thoſe of Moſes. Scaliger's opinion ſeems

* Antiq. lib. xiii. cap. x. §. 6. p. 663. Δεγον ικεινα δειν ηγειδαι νομικα τα γεγραμμενα, τα δ' εκ παραδοσεως των πατερων μη τηρειν. The word νομικα is here applied to τα γεγραμμενα the whole ſcripture, as oppoſed to tradition; and the word νομων ſeems to be uſed in the ſame comprehenſive ſenſe, lib. xviii. cap. i. §. 4. p. 871.

† Cod. Sanhedrin, cap. Chelek ab init. Vid. Reland. Antiq. part. ii. cap. ix. §. x. p. 273. edit. 3. Sadducæi teſtimonium citant contra reſurrectionem ex Job vii. 9. in Ilmedenu, fol. 2. col. 4. inquit Druſius, de tribus ſectis Judæor. lib. iii. cap. ix. in margin. See eſpecially Lightfoot, Horæ hebraic. John iv. 25.

(*a*) John viii. 48.

ſeems to be more probable, that they did not reject the prophets and the hagiographa, but only expounded them in a different ſenſe from the Phariſees and other Jews *.

It is a queſtion of ſome difficulty, how the Sadducees could diſbelieve the exiſtence of angels, and yet receive even the five books of Moſes as canonical ſcripture, wherein are ſo many narratives of the appearance of angels. Probably their opinion concerning angels was, that they were not permanent beings, but temporary phantoms, formed by the divine power for particular purpoſes, and diſſipated again when theſe were anſwered.

In the time of Joſephus this ſect was not large, but is ſaid to be the richeſt; and that thoſe of the greateſt quality and opulence generally belonged to it †; which we can eaſily credit, as we obſerve in our day, that the great and rich are apt to prefer the pleaſure and grandeur of this life to any expectancy in a future; and greedily to embrace ſuch doctrines as tend to encourage their luxury and ſenſuality, by ridding their minds of uneaſy reflections on the judgment-day and world to come ‡.

* Scaliger, ubi ſupra. Druſius de tribus ſectis Judæor. lib. iii. cap. ix. & Reſponſ. ad Serar. Minerv. lib. ii. cap. xi. Reland. Antiq. part. ii. cap. ix. §. x. p. 273.

† Joſeph. Antiq. lib. xiii. cap. x. §. 6. p. 663. lib. xviii. cap. i. §. 4. p 871.

‡ See an account of the Sadducees, not only in the authors before-cited, but in Le Clerc's Hiſtor. Eccleſ. prolegom. Sect. i. cap. iii. p. 12,—15. Baſnage's hiſtory of the Jews, book ii. chap. vi. vii. Bayle's dictionary, article Sadducees; and Lightfoot, horæ hebr. Matt. iii. 7.

Of

Of the Samaritans.

With the Sadducees Godwin joins the Samaritans, with whom he ſays they have a near affinity; that is, on ſuppoſition of their rejecting all the ſacred writings but the five books of Moſes; which Origen *, Jerom † and Epiphanius ‡ ſay the Samaritans did.

The Samaritans were originally heathens, conſiſting of perſons of ſeveral nations, to whom the king of Aſſyria gave the cities and lands of the Iſraelites upon the Aſſyrian captivity They were called Samaritans from the city Samaria, the metropolis of the kingdom of Iſrael. When they firſt ſettled in the country, they practiſed only the idolatrous rites of the ſeveral nations from whence they came; but upon being infeſted with lions, which they ſuppoſed a judgment upon them for not paying due honour to the ancient God of the country, the king of Aſſyria ſent a jewiſh prieſt to inſtruct them in the worſhip of Jehovah; upon which out of the ſeveral cuſtoms and modes of worſhip of the nations to which they belonged, and the rites of the worſhip of Jehovah, they made up a very motley religion (*a*). Upon the return of the Jews from the babyloniſh captivity, and the rebuilding

* Origen. contra Celſum, lib. i. p. 38. edit. Cantab. 1677. Comment. in Johan. apud Comment. in ſcripturas, part. poſterior. p. 218. edit. Huet. Colon. 1685.

† Hieron. in Dialogo adverſus Luciferianos, as quoted by Prideaux, part i. book vi. anno 409 ante Chriſtum, vol. 2. p. 597.

‡ Epiphan. adverſus Hæres. lib. 1. hæres. ix. Samarit. §. ii. tom. 1. p. 24. edit. Petav. Colon. 1682.

(*a*) 2 Kings xvii. 24, & ſeq.

rebuilding Jeruſalem and the temple, the religion of the Samaritans received another alteration on the following occaſion. One of the ſons of Jehoiada the high-prieſt, whom Joſephus calls Manaſſeh *, married the daughter of Sanballat the Horonite; but the law of God having forbidden the intermarriages of the Iſraelites with any other nation, Nehemiah ſet himſelf to reform this corruption, which had ſpread into many jewiſh families; and obliged all that had taken ſtrange wives immediately to part with them (*a*). Manaſſeh, unwilling to quit his wife, fled to Samaria; and many others, who were in the ſame caſe with him, being alſo of the ſame mind, went and ſettled under the protection of Sanballat, governor of Samaria. From that time the worſhip of the Samaritans came much nearer to that of the Jews; and they afterward obtained leave of Alexander the great to build a temple on mount Gerizim, near the city Samaria, in imitation of the temple at Jeruſalem; where they practiced the ſame forms of worſhip. It is very common for people, who are nearly, but not intirely, of the ſame religion, to have a greater averſion to one another, than thoſe whoſe ſentiments and forms of worſhip are more different. So it was with the Jews and Samaritans. Hence it was the higheſt term of reproach among the Jews to call a perſon a Samaritan, as was before obſerved; and ſo great was their mutual animoſity, that they would neither aſk, nor receive, any favours from each other. The woman of Samaria therefore wondered, that Chriſt, "being a Jew,

* Joſeph. Antiq. lib. xi. cap. viii. §. 1, 2. p. 578, 579.
(*a*) Nehem. xiii. 23,—30.

Jew, would aſk drink of her who was a Samaritan (*a*)." And when our Lord had occaſion to paſs through Samaria, as he was going to Jeruſalem to keep one of the annual feaſts at the temple, the Samaritans would give him no entertainment on his journey, not merely becauſe he was a Jew, but becauſe, deſigning to keep the feaſt at Jeruſalem, he plainly preferred that temple above theirs (*b*). As to what Godwin advances, that the Samaritans allowed of no commerce with the Jews, which he grounds on the forecited paſſage concerning the ſurprize of the woman of Samaria, that Chriſt, being a Jew, aſked drink of her, who was a Samaritan; and its being added as the reaſon of this, "for the Jews have no dealings with, συγχρῶνται, the Samaritans (*c*);" I ſay, the opinion that the Samaritans permitted no kind of commerce with the Jews, is evidently confuted, by our being informed, that while this converſation paſſed between our Saviour and the woman, "the diſciples were gone into the city" of Samaria, "to buy meat (*d*)." Nothing can be meant, therefore, by συγχρῶνται, but that they would have no friendly intercourſe, nor perform acts of mutual civility *.

(*a*) John iv. 9. (*b*) Luke ix. 52, 53.
(*c*) John iv. 9. (*d*) ver. 8.

* See concerning the Samaritans, Reland. Diſſertat. miſcellan. vol. 2. Diſſert. vii. de Samaritanis. Prideaux's Connect. part. i. book 6. ſub anno 409. ante Chriſtum.

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

Of the ESSENES.

THE Eſſenes, though no notice is taken of them, at leaſt by name, in any part of the ſcripture hiſtory, were yet a conſiderable ſect among the Jews, of whom both Joſephus and Philo have given a large account; the former in the twelfth chapter of his ſecond book of the jewiſh war, where he profeſſedly treats of the three principal ſects of the Jews, the Phariſees, the Sadducees and the Eſſenes. He likewiſe ſpeaks of them occaſionally in ſeveral other parts of his works. Philo in his book, entituled, Omnis probus liber *, gives a very particular account of the dogmata and manners of this ſect, nearly, though not quite, the ſame with that of Joſephus. It is very poſſible there might be ſome little difference betwixt the Eſſenes in Egypt and thoſe in Judea; and Philo, who was an alexandrian jew, was acquainted only with the former, Joſephus, an inhabitant of Judea, only with the latter. Pliny, the natural hiſtorian,

* See alſo Philo de vitâ contemplativâ.

torian, hath left us ſome account of the Eſſenes in the ſeventeenth chapter of the fifth book of his hiſtory *.

Theſe are the only ancient writers, who ſpeak of the Eſſenes, on whoſe narratives, as they were contemporary with them, we may depend. As for what Epiphanius, and other ancient and modern authors, have ſaid of them, it can only be by conjecture, any further than they have taken their materials from thoſe abovementioned.

The etymology of the name has given grammarians and criticks no little trouble. Joſephus is ſilent upon it. Philo derives it from ὅσιος, holy, becauſe of the extraordinary ſanctity of the Eſſenes, though he confeſſes that derivation is not grammatical †. Epiphanius goes the furtheſt for the etymology, of any, deriving the name from Jeſſe the father of David ‡. Salmaſius fetches it from a city called Eſſa, mentioned by Joſephus, from whence he imagines this ſect firſt ſprung §. Serarius hath given us, at leaſt, a dozen different etymologies ‖. So various and uncertain are the conjectures of the learned on this ſubject.

Godwin derives it from the Syraic word ʾDN aſa, which ſignifies to heal or cure, becauſe

* The ſeveral accounts are inſerted at large in Dr. Prideaux's connection, part 2. book 5. ſub fin.

† Philo in tractat. Omnis probus liber, oper. p. 678. C. Colon. Allobr. 1613. Vid. Serar. Trihæres. lib. iii. cap. 1. p. 109. J. Scaliger. Elench. Trihæres. Serar. cap. xviii. in init.

‡ Epiphan. Hæres. xix. lib. i. tom. ii. §. iv. p. 120. edit. Petav.

§ Salmaſ. Plinian. exercitat. in Solinum. cap. 35. p. 432. edit. Ultraject.

‖ Serar. Trihæres. Judæor. lib. iii. cap. i. p. 106,—110. edit. Trigland. 1703.

cauſe Philo calls thoſe of the Eſſenes, who devoted themſelves to a contemplative life, θεραπευται therapeutæ, which is naturally derived from θεραπευειν, ſanare; yet not, as Godwin erroneouſly ſays, becauſe they ſtudied phyſic, according to the common acceptation of that word; but becauſe, ſaith Philo, they cure men's ſouls of thoſe diſeaſes which they have contracted by their paſſions and vices. Or otherwiſe, as he adds, they have this name, becauſe they have learnt to worſhip and ſerve that being, who is better than good, more uncompounded than the number one, and more ancient than unity itſelf *: for the word θεραπευτης, ſignifies a worſhipper or ſervant, as well as a phyſician †.

Theſe therapeutæ are diſtinguiſhed from thoſe, whom Philo calls practical Eſſenes, who were employed in the labours of huſbandry and other mechanic arts; though only in ſuch as belonged to peace, for none of them would ever put their hands to the making ſwords, or arrows, or any other inſtruments of war ‡.

Both Joſephus and Philo give a ſurpriſing account of their auſtere way of life. Their houſes were mean; their cloaths made of wool without any dye; they never changed their cloaths or ſhoes, till they were quite worn out; their food was plain and coarſe, and their drink water; they neglected all bodily ornaments, and would by no means anoint themſelves with

* Philo de vitâ contemplativâ, ab init. oper. p. 688. B. C. Valeſius, in his notes on Euſebius's Eccleſ. Hiſtor. lib. ii. cap. xvii. p. 66. not. 3. endeavours to prove againſt Scaliger, that the Therapeutæ, ſo largely deſcribed by Philo, are not to be reckoned in the number of the Eſſenes.

† Vid. Lexic. Conſtantin. in verb.

‡ Philo. tractat. Quod omnis probus liber, oper. p. 678. E, D.

oil, according to the faſhion of thoſe times. Nay, if any one of them happened to be anointed againſt his will, he would preſently wipe off the oil, and waſh himſelf, as from ſome pollution. They lived in ſodalities, and had all their goods in common; their morals were very exact and pure, and they kept the ſabbath more ſtrictly than any of the Jews *.

In the account which Godwin gives of the dogmata of this ſect, collected from Joſephus and Philo, he aſſerts, that the Pythagoreans forbad oaths, and ſo, ſaith he, did the Eſſenes †. But this, I apprehend, is a miſtake as to the Pythagoreans, and perhaps alſo, as to the Eſſenes. The former, it is well known, uſed an oath on important occaſions, and held it to be moſt ſacred; ſwearing by the number four, which they wrote by ten dots in the form of a triangle; ſo that each ſide conſiſted of four dots, thus:  . Some have imagined Pythagoras took the hint of this from the Nomen Tetragrammaton of the Jews ‡; and that having likewiſe acquired ſome notion of the trinity, he intended to expreſs it by the triangle, which is called his Trigonon myſticum.

As for the Eſſenes, Joſephus ſaith, that before any are admitted to eat at the common table, they bind themſelves by ſolemn oath to obſerve the rules of the ſociety §. Godwin

* Philo ubi ſupra, p. 678,—680. Joſeph. de bello judaic. lib. ii. cap. viii. §. 2,—13. p. 160,—165.

† Joſeph. de bell. jud. ubi ſupra, §. 6. Philo. ubi ſupra, p. 679. C.

‡ Diog. Laert. in vitâ Pythag. lib. viii. Segm. 33. Lucian. Dialog. Vitarum Auctio, oper. tom. 3. p. 103. cum annot. Cognati, p. 131. edit. Baſil. & Galei Philoſoph. General. lib. ii. cap. iii. §. 2. p. 173, 175.

§ Joſeph. de bell. ubi ſupra, §. 7. p. 163. In the former

Godwin likewiſe maintains, that the Pythagoreans uſed only inanimate ſacrifices; and ſo ſaith he, did the Eſſenes; they ſent gifts to the temple, but did not ſacrifice. But how will this account of the Pythagoreans agree with the ſtory mentioned by Diogenes Laertius and others *, that Pythagoras himſelf ſacrificed a hecatomb, upon his diſcovering what is called the pythagoric theorem, namely, that in a right-angled triangle, the ſquare of the hypothenuſe is equal to the ſum of the ſquares of the ſides? As for the Eſſenes it is not eaſy to reconcile their not uſing animal ſacrifices with the profound veneration which they profeſſed for the five books of Moſes, in which ſo many animal ſacrifices are enjoined. Joſephus indeed ſaith, they ſend their gifts, αναθηματα, to the temple, but offer no ſacrifices there by reaſon of the different rules of purity, which they have inſtituted among themſelves. And therefore, being excluded the common temple, they ſacrifice apart by themſelves; τας θυσιας επιτελουσι: the word θυσιας imports animal ſacrifices, that were ſlain †.

mer paſſage §. 6. his expreſſion is, το δε ομνυειν αυτους περιιστασθαι, χειρον τι της επιορκιας υπολαμβανοντες, though here he ſaith, πριν δε της κοινης αψασθαι τροφης, ορκους αυτους ομνυσι φρικωδεις, κ. τ. λ. And in §. 8. he ſpeaks of them as τοις ορκοις και τοις εθεσι ενδεδεμενοι, and the like in other places.

* Diog. Laert. de vitis Philoſophorum, lib. viii. vit. Pythagor. Segm. 12. p. 497. Amſtel. 1692. Cicero repreſents Cotta as giving no credit to this ſtory, becauſe, as he apprehends, Pythagoras never uſed animal ſacrifices. Cicer. de naturâ Deorum, lib. iii. cap. 36. But it is related alſo by Athenæus, Deipnoſoph. lib. x. p. 418. F. edit. Caſaub. 1598. See alſo Plutarch. in comment. Non poſſe ſuaviter vivi ſecundum Epicur. oper. tom. 2. p. 1094. B. Francof. 1620.

† Joſeph. Antiq. lib. xviii. cap. i. §. 5. p. 871. Yet Dr. Ibbotſon

3dly, Godwin ſaith, the Eſſenes worſhip towards the riſing ſun; and this he grounds on a paſſage in Joſephus; on the authority of which ſome have charged them with worſhipping the ſun itſelf. The words are, Προς γε μην τα Θειον ιδιως ευσεβεις· πριν γαρ ανασχειν τον Ηλιον, ουδεν διεγγονται των βεβηλων, παλριους δε τινας ως αυτον ευχας, ωσπερ ικετευοντες αναλαλαι*. If Ηλιον, indeed, be the antecedent to αυτον, it muſt imply that they prayed to the ſun itſelf. But this is not neceſſarily the conſtruction; for though το θειον, which is of the neuter gender, cannot be the antecedent to αυτον, yet αυτον may very well be ſuppoſed to agree with Θεον underſtood †. Accordingly Dr. Prideaux tranſlates the words thus, "They are, in whatever pertaineth to God, in an eſpecial manner religious; for before the ſun is riſen, they ſpeak of no common worldly matter, but till then offer up unto God their prayers in ancient forms, received from their predeceſſors; ſupplicating particularly in them, that he would make the ſun to riſe upon them." If this criticiſm be not admitted, it is nevertheleſs much more eaſy to ſuppoſe an error in the copy, αυτον for αυτο, than that the Eſſenes, who had a more than ordinary zeal for the law of Moſes, ſhould be guilty of ſuch groſs idolatry as to worſhip the ſun.

There

Ibbotſon (ſee his note in loc.) renders the words, εφ' αυτων τας θυσιας επιτελεσι, very differently from the tranſlation uſed above, which is that of Dr. Prideaux; his verſion is, in ſeipſis ſacrificia peragunt, i. e. ſeſe ipſos Deo vovebant & conſecrabant. edit. Haverc.

* Joſeph. De bello judaic. lib. ii. cap. viii. §. 5. p. 161, 162.

† See Waehneri Antiquitates Ebæor. vol. 2. Sect. vii. cap. v. §. 62. p. 775, 776. Gottingæ, 1742.

There was a notion firſt ſtarted by Euſebius *, and eagerly embraced by many roman catholicks †, that the Therapeutæ were chriſtian aſceticks or monks, converted and inſtituted by St. Mark: Which improbable ſuggeſtion Godwin refutes by the following arguments: In Philo's treatiſe concerning the Therapeutæ, or de vitâ contemplativâ, there is no mention of Chriſt or Chriſtians, the evangeliſts or apoſtles: Again, the Therapeutæ are not mentioned as a new ſect, as the Chriſtians then were; on the contrary, he ſtiles their doctrine "a philoſophy derived to them by tradition from their forefathers;" and ſaith, "they have the commentaries of the ancients, who were the authors of this ſect ‡:" Again, the inſcription of Philo's treatiſe is not only περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ, but alſo περὶ ἱκετῶν ἀρετῶν, and Philo elſewhere calling the whole jewiſh nation ἱκετικὸν γένος §, it may from hence be inferred, that the Therapeutæ were Jews, not Chriſtians ‖. However, it is not impoſſible, that ſome of theſe jewiſh Therapeutæ, becoming Chriſtians, might ſtill affect their former recluſe way of living, and being imitated by others, might give the firſt occaſion to monkery among Chriſtians.

We have no guide, to enable us to diſcover the origin of this ſect. Pliny, indeed, ſaith,

* Euſeb. Eccleſ. hiſtor. lib. ii. cap. xvii. p. 66. ad fin. capitis.

† Serarii Trihæres. lib. iii. cap. xvii.

‡ Philo de vitâ contemplativâ, oper. p. 691. C.

§ Philo de Legation, §. iii. cap. xviii. ad Caium, ab init.

‖ See this opinion of Euſebius, well confuted likewiſe by Valeſius, Euſeb. Eccleſ. hiſt. lib. ii. cap. xvii. p. 68. not. 1. edit. Reading, Cantab. 1720. and by Scaliger in his Elenchus Trihæres. Serarii, cap. xxix.

though we know not upon what authority, that it had ſubſiſted for ſeveral thouſand years *. The moſt probable opinion is, that it begun a little before the time of the Maccabees, when the faithful Jews were forced to fly from the cruel perſecution of their enemies, into deſarts and caves; and by living in thoſe retreats many of them being habituated to retirement, which thereby became moſt agreeable to them, they choſe to continue it, even when they might have appeared upon the publick ſtage again, and accordingly formed themſelves into recluſes. As to the numbers of which this ſect conſiſted, Philo and Joſephus agree that in Judea there were about four thouſand; but in Egypt Philo makes the number of them to be much larger †.

The abſolute ſilence of the evangelical hiſtory concerning the Eſſenes is by ſome accounted for from their eremetic life, which ſecluded them from places of publick reſort; ſo that they did not come in the way of our Saviour, as the Phariſees and Sadducees often did.

Others are of opinion, that the Eſſenes, being very honeſt and ſincere, without guile or hypocriſy, gave no room for the reproofs and cenſures, which the other Jews deſerved; and therefore no mention is made of them.

But though they are not expreſsly mentioned in any of the ſacred books, it is ſuppoſed, and not without reaſon, that they are referred to by St. Paul in the ſecond chapter of his epiſtle to the Coloſſians: "Let no man, ſaith

* Plin. hiſtor. natur. lib. v. cap. 17.

† Philo in Tractat. Quod omnis probus liber, oper. p. 678. C. Et de vitâ contemplativâ, p. 690. E. Joſeph. Antiq. lib. xviii. cap. 1. §. 5.

ſaith he, beguile you of your reward, in a voluntary humility, and worſhipping of angels, intruding into thoſe things, which he hath not ſeen, vainly puffed up by his fleſhly mind:—which things have indeed a ſhew of wiſdom, in will-worſhip and humility, and neglecting of the body (*a*)." What is here ſaid of a voluntary humility, and neglecting the body, is in a peculiar manner applicable to the Eſſenes; and by Joſephus it appears, that they had ſomething peculiar among them relating to the angels; for he ſaith, "that when they received any into their number, they made them ſolemnly ſwear, that they would keep and obſerve the books of the ſect, and the names of the angels with care *." What is ſaid of "intruding into things not ſeen," is likewiſe agreeable to the character of the therapeutic eſſenes, who placing the excelſence of their contemplative life in raiſing their minds to inviſible objects, pretended to ſuch a degree of abſtraction and elevation, as to be able to dive into the nature of angels, and aſſign them proper names, or rightly interpret thoſe already given them; and likewiſe to pry into futurity and foretel things to come †. Upon which it is highly probable, "they were vainly puffed up by their fleſhly mind." Moreover, the dogmata to which St. Paul refers in the following words, "Touch not, taſte not, handle not (*b*)," are ſuch as the Eſſenes held; who would not taſte any pleaſant food, but lived upon coarſe bread, and drank

(*a*) Coloſſ. ii. 18, 23.

* Joſeph. de bello judaic. lib. ii. cap. viii. §. 7. ſub fin. p. 163.

† Joſep. de bello judaic. lib. ii. cap. viii. §. 12. p. 165.

(*b*) ver. 21.

nothing but water *; and ſome of them would not taſte any food at all till after ſun ſet †, and who, if they were touched by any that were not of their own ſect, would waſh themſelves, as after ſome great pollution ‡. Perhaps there might be a ſodality of Eſſenes at Coloſs, as there were in many other places out of Judea; and that ſome of the Chriſtians, too much inclined to Judaiſm, might alſo affect the peculiarities of this ſect; which might be the reaſon of the apoſtle's ſo particularly cautioning againſt them §.

* Philo de vitâ contemplativâ, p. 692. B. p. 696. D.

† Philo, ubi ſupra, p. 692. A.

‡ Joſeph. ubi ſupra, §. 10. p. 164.

§ Concerning the Eſſenes, beſides the references above, ſee Serarii Trihæreſis, Druſius de tribus ſectis Judæor. Scaliger's Elenchus Trihæres. Serarii; Clerici Prolegom. ad hiſtor. Eccleſ. ſect. i. cap. iv, v. p. 16,—29. and Baſnage's hiſtory of the Jews, book 2. chap. 12, 13.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIII.

Of the Gaulonites and Herodians.

THE Gaulonites were not a religious ſect, but a political faction, raiſed up and headed by Judas of Galilee, who is mentioned in the fifth chapter of the Acts (*a*). Joſephus calls him Ιυδας Γαυλανιτης in the firſt chapter of the eighteenth book of his antiquities *; yet in the title or contents of that chapter, and in the fifth chapter of the twentieth book, he is ſtiled Ιυδας ὁ Γαλιλαιος †. Judas the Gaulonite, therefore, and Judas of Galilee were the ſame perſon; indifferently called by one or the other of thoſe names, becauſe Gaulona, his native country, which lay beyond Jordan, was otherwiſe called Galilee, or Galilee of the gentiles (*b*), to diſtinguiſh it from the other Galilee on this ſide Jordan.

This Judas, it ſeems, had raiſed and headed an inſurrection againſt the roman government, on occaſion of the tax which Auguſtus levied on Judea, when he reduced it into the form of a roman

(*a*) Acts v. 37.
* §. 1. p. 869. edit. Haverc.
† §. 2. p. 965. (*b*) Matt. iv. 15. & alibi.

a roman province *. This party was ſoon ſuppreſſed, and we read no more of it in the New Teſtament; unleſs, perhaps, as Godwin conjectures, thoſe perſons were ſome of this faction, otherwiſe called Galileans, whom Pilate ſlew as they were performing the ſacred rites at the altar, and thereby mingled their blood with their ſacrifices (*a*).

As for the Herodians, they are paſſed over in ſilence both by Joſephus and Philo, and only known by being mentioned in three paſſages of the New Teſtament hiſtory. We find them combined with the Phariſees in endeavouring to entangle our Saviour with that enſnaring queſtion, "Whether it was lawful to give tribute to Cæſar (*b*)." We read of the Phariſees taking council with the Herodians againſt Jeſus, how they might deſtroy him (*c*); and we hear our Lord charging his diſciples to take heed and beware of the leaven of the Phariſees, and of Herod: which is commonly underſtood of the ſect of the Herodians, who derived their name from Herod (*d*). This account of the Herodians is ſo conciſe, that it hath left room for almoſt numberleſs conjectures concerning them.

Some make them to be a political party, others a religious ſect. The firſt opinion is favoured by the Syriac verſion, which every where ſtiles the Herodians, the domeſtics of Herod; and it is alledged, that the author of this verſion,

* Joſeph. de bello judaic. lib. ii. cap. viii. §. 1. p. 160. Antiq. lib. xvii. cap. ult. §. ult. & lib. xviii. cap. 1. §. 1. p. 867, 869, 870.

(*a*) Luke xiii. 1. (*b*) Matt. xxii, 16, 17.
(*c*) Mark iii 6. (*d*) Mark viii. 15.

ſion, as he was nearly cotemporary with them had the beſt means of knowing who they were. It is likewiſe argued, that they could not be a religious ſect, becauſe Joſephus, who profeſſedly gives an account of the ſeveral religious ſects of the Jews, neither on that occaſion nor on any other, makes any mention of the Herodians. On the other hand, in favour of the opinion that they were a religious ſect, it is pleaded, that our Saviour's cautioning his diſciples againſt the leaven of Herod, implies, that the Herodians were diſtinguiſhed from the other Jews by ſome doctrinal tenets, leaven being explained by our Saviour himſelf to ſignify doctrine (a).

It is probable the truth lies betwixt theſe two opinions, or rather comprehends them both.

The notion, that the Herodians were a ſet of people who held Herod to be the Meſſiah, which is eſpouſed by Tertullian *, Epiphanius †, Jerom ‡, Chryſoſtom §, and Theophilact ‖ among the ancients, and by Grotius §§, as well as others of the moderns, is without ſufficient foundation, and highly improbable; whether we underſtand it to be meant of Herod the great, who died ſoon after our Saviour was born; or of Herod Antipas, who reigned at the

(a) See Matt. xvi. 6, 12.

* Tertullian. de Præſcriptione Hæreticor. cap. xlv. ſub fin. oper. p. 219. B. edit. Rigalt. Paris 1675.

† Epiphan. adverſus Hæreſes, hæres. xx. §. 1. p. 45. edit. Petav. Colon. 1682.

‡ Hieron. contra Luciferianos, cap. 16. though in his comment. on Matt. xxii. 15, 16. he rejects this opinion.

§ Chryſoſt. in Marc. xii. 13.

‖ Theophylact. in Matt. xxii. 16, p. 131. Paris 1635.

§§ Grotius de Veritate Chriſtian. Relig. lib. v. ſect. xiv. ſub fin. in not. & apud annot. in Matt. xvi. 6.

the time of his perſonal miniſtry; ſince neither of them were native Iſraelites, and it cannot well be ſuppoſed, that any Jews were ſo ignorant as to take a foreigner for the Meſſiah, who had been ſo expreſsly promiſed them to be raiſed up among themſelves, of the tribe of Judah, and of the houſe of David. Beſides, ſuppoſing any of them had been ſo ſtupid as to apprehend the firſt Herod to be the Meſſiah, no doubt his death, to ſay nothing of his wicked and odious adminiſtration, would long ſince have convinced them of their miſtake; ſince he had been very far from accompliſhing the deliverance of Iſrael from all oppreſſion, which they expected from the Meſſiah. And as for the ſecond Herod, his dominions were ſmall and his power little, in compariſon with the former; Judea now being reduced into the form of a roman province; ſo that he was little more than the procurator of Galilee, with the title only of king. It is therefore utterly inconceivable, that any ſhould take him for the Meſſiah.

The moſt probable opinion concerning the Herodians ſeems to be that of Dr. Prideaux *, that they derived their name from Herod the great, and were diſtinguiſhed from the Phariſees and other Jews by their falling in with Herod's ſcheme of ſubjecting himſelf and his dominions to the Romans, and likewiſe by complying with many of their heathen uſages and cuſtoms. In their zeal for the roman authority they were diametrically oppoſite to the Phariſees, who eſteemed it unlawful to ſubmit, or pay taxes, to the roman emperor; an opinion, which they grounded

* Prideaux's Connect. part. 2. book 5. ſub fin.

grounded on their being forbidden by the law to ſet a ſtranger over them, who was not one of their own nation, as their king. The conjunction of the Herodians, therefore, with the Phariſees againſt Chriſt is a memorable proof of the keenneſs of their reſentment and malice againſt him; eſpecially, when we conſider that they united together in propoſing to him an inſnaring queſtion on a ſubject which was the ground of their mutual diſſention; namely, whether it was lawful to pay tribute to Ceſar? and provided he anſwered in the negative, the Herodians would accuſe him of treaſon againſt the ſtate; and ſhould he reply in the affirmative, the Phariſees were as ready to excite the people againſt him, as an enemy to their civil liberties and privileges.

It is probable the Herodians were diſtinguiſhed likewiſe, by their compliance with ſome heathen idolatrous uſages which Herod had introduced; who, as Joſephus ſaith, built a temple to Ceſar near the head of the river Jordan*, erected a magnificent theatre at Jeruſalem, inſtituted pagan games †, and placed a golden eagle over the gate of the temple of Jehovah ‡; and as he elſewhere intimates, furniſhed the temples which he reared in ſeveral places out of Judea, with images for idolatrous worſhip, in order to ingratiate himſelf with the emperor and the people of Rome; though to the Jews he pretended, that he did it againſt his will, and in obedience to the imperial command §. This ſymbolizing with idolatry upon views of intereſt

* Antiq. lib. xv. cap. x. §. 3. p. 776.
† cap. viii. §. 1, 2. p. 766.
‡ De bell. judaic, lib. 1. cap. xxxiii. §. 23. p. 139.
§ Antiq. lib. xv. cap. ix. §. 5. p. 772.

intereſt and worldly policy, was probably the leaven of Herod, which our Saviour cautioned his diſciples againſt.

It is further probable, that the Herodians were chiefly of the ſect of the Sadducees, who ſate looſeſt to religion of all the Jews; ſince that which is called by St. Mark (*a*) the leaven of Herod, is in the parallel place in St. Matthew (*b*), ſtiled the leaven of the Sadducees *.

(*a*) Mark viii. 15. (*b*) Matt. xvi. 6.

* See on this ſubject Prideaux's connect. part 2. book 5. ſub fin. Baſnage's hiſtory of the Jews, book 2. chap. 14.

The End of the Firſt Volume.

5 DE60

ERRATA.

Page	line	
10	3	from the bottom, for ισχυρος read ισχυρος
25	22	for daughter read daughters
31	12	for jeſhuru read jaſhuru
60	17	and in ſome other places, for then read than
62	5	for Jehthah read Jephthah
82	5	from the bottom and in ſome other places, for pole-tax read poll-tax
94	1	for φορος read τιλος
	2	for τιλος read φορος
		Note † line 1 for hic read his
119	4	for gnèther gnèther read gnedher gnedher
120	10	from the bottom, for τη read τη,
121	15	from the bottom, for John read Jehu
177	2	for tells read tell
191	5	from the bottom, for lecohèn read lecahèn
212	20	and line 21 for high-prieſts read high-prieſt
230	5	from the bottom, for צייצ read ציץ
243	4	from the bottom, for rites read rite
273	16	for eight read eighth
281	14, 15	for countries read country
306	2	for creature read creatures
307	7, 8	for firſt things read firſtlings
317		Note *, line 2 for Du Viel read De Veil
344	1	for choſeh read chozeh
370	3	from the bottom, for Maimonides when, read Maimonides, When
373	10	from the bottom, for contray read contrary
378	6	for cherubbim read Chetubbim
381	5	for us read them
387	2	for חכמים read חכמים
389	1	for ספר read ספר
394	1	dele written
395	19	for ספרים read ספרים
401	10	for be Jews read be the Jews
	24	for or read of
405	12	for tradition read traditions
415	10	before for inſert as
	13	for naſa read naſar
	2	from the bottom, for nazèr read nazir
430	11	for חסידים read חסידים
438	4	for in read on.
444	20	for According read Accordingly